United Nations S/PV.7195

Security Council

Distr.: General
9 June 2014

Original: English

Official communiqué of the 7195th (closed) meeting of the Security Council

Held in private at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 9 June 2014, at 3 p.m.

In accordance with rule 55 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the following communiqué was issued through the Secretary-General in place of a verbatim record:

"On 9 June 2014, the Security Council, pursuant to annex II, sections A and B of resolution 1353 (2001), held its 7195th meeting in private with the troop- and police-contributing countries to the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire.

"The President invited Ms. Aïchatou Mindouadou, Special Representative and Head of the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire, to participate in the meeting in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

"The Security Council and the troop- and police-contributing countries heard a briefing by Ms. Mindouadou, via video-teleconference from Abidjan.

"Members of the Council, Ms. Mindouadou and representatives of participating contributing countries had an exchange of views."

14-54999 (E) 090614

Please recycle

United Nations S/PV.7196

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7196th meeting

Wednesday, 11 June 2014, 9.30 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Churkin/Mr. Pankin/Mr. Iliichev	(Russian Federation)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Perceval
	Australia	Ms. King
	Chad	Mr. Cherif
	Chile	Mr. Llanos
	China	Mr. Wang Min
	France	Mr. Araud
	Jordan	Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein
	Lithuania	Ms. Murmokaitė
	Luxembourg	Ms. Lucas
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Oh Joon
	Rwanda	Mr. Gasana
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

United Nations peacekeeping operations

New trends

Letter dated 1 June 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2014/384)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506. Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

14-42664 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 9.35 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

United Nations peacekeeping operations

New trends

Letter dated 1 June 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2014/384)

The President (*spoke in Russian*): In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malawi, Malaysia, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Viet Nam to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Thomas Mayr-Harting, Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2014/384, which contains a letter dated 1 June 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept paper on the item under consideration.

I wish to warmly welcome the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and before giving him the floor I would like to make an important statement.

In a few hours, Mr. Ban Ki-moon will depart on yet another international tour. It will be a long and difficult one. Clearly, there is something symbolic in the fact that on 13 June — his seventieth birthday — the foremost diplomat on the planet will be travelling to the highest world capital, La Paz. He will go there from Brazil, where he will attend the opening of the soccer World Cup championship, which, as we know, is also marking an anniversary. It is also highly symbolic that the birth of the Secretary-General was essentially a harbinger of the universal Organization.

I am sure that I speak for all members of the Security Council and all those present today when I say that, through his activities at the head of world diplomacy, which are commensurate with his wealth of experience and professionalism, inexhaustible energy and commitment to universal ideals, Mr. Ban Ki-moon is indeed serving the international community. I wish him every success in his noble work for the benefit humankind.

I now give the floor to the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General: I thank the Russian Federation for providing this important opportunity to collectively examine trends in United Nations peacekeeping. I also thank you, Mr. President, for your very kind words of encouragement and support. I am deeply touched by such strong official and personal support for my work as Secretary-General. I can assure you, the members of the Council and the other Members of the United Nations that I will devote all my energy and time to working with you to achieve everything that we are working together to achieve in terms of peace, stability, development and human rights. I count on your continuing support and leadership.

This is a key moment for this flagship United Nations activity. We face huge peacekeeping challenges. New phenomena are affecting our work and new approaches are on display. I would therefore like to highlight four aspects of peacekeeping that are particularly important for discussion at this time.

First, United Nations peacekeeping operations are increasingly mandated to operate where there is no peace to keep. We see significant levels of violence in Darfur, South Sudan, Mali, the Central African Republic and the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, where more than two-thirds of all our military, police and civilian personnel are operating.

Secondly, some United Nations peacekeeping operations are being authorized in the absence of clearly identifiable parties to the conflict or a viable political process. When there is no clear path towards peace, crises will inevitably recur and peacekeeping operations are much more likely to struggle to meet their mandates. In Mali, no comprehensive agreement was in place and the situation remains precarious. In the Central African Republic, while there was a political

framework for transition, the process has been gravely undermined by intercommunal violence. In South Sudan, conflict has re-emerged.

Thirdly, United Nations peacekeeping operations are increasingly operating in more complex environments that feature asymmetric and unconventional threats. Whether acting in self-defence or implementing our mandate to protect civilians, we need to ensure that United Nations peacekeeping operations are undertaken in full compliance with international human rights and humanitarian law obligations.

Fourthly, we need to build on what I see as the renewed commitment of the Security Council to responding to our changing world. Resolution 2098 (2013), on the Democratic Republic of the Congo, was a milestone. It signalled the resolve of the Security Council to address the changing nature of conflict and the operating environment of United Nations peacekeeping, and it matched that resolve with credible capabilities, provided thanks to the contribution of troop -contributing countries. The results are tangible improvements in the lives of people living in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo.

However, a broader discussion is needed on how United Nations peacekeeping should adapt to new demands and what capabilities and resources it needs to adapt. We must also ask what are the limits of United Nations peacekeeping and whether it is always the right tool. As we approach the 15-year anniversary of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809), it may be necessary to again take stock of evolving expectations of United Nations peacekeeping and how the Organization can work towards a shared view of the way forward To this end, I have asked the Secretariat to initiate work on a review of United Nations peacekeeping.

Mandates, political leverage, logistical support, training, accountability, rules of engagement, technological innovation, and clarity on the caveats of troop- and police-contributing countries are just a few areas that may warrant review. Laying the groundwork for the extension of State authority, including building justice and corrections capacities, is also essential in the first phases until national and other partners are able to take over. Reinforced efforts to ensure adequate force protection and capabilities may be required.

We must also use all possible forms of technology that can enable our peacekeeping personnel to operate more safely and cost-effectively. We will continue to consult with the legislative bodies on the deployment of unmanned, unarmed aerial vehicles based on the experience we have gained with their deployment to the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Speed is also critical. When civilians are under imminent threat, every minute counts. While there have been improvements in the mechanisms and speed with which the United Nations deploys uniformed personnel, it does not have a standing reserve force that it can deploy on short notice once a Council decision is taken. It must rely on its Member States for force generation, coupled with its own strengthened planning. It is important that we all work together to ensure that we are able to deploy or reinforce our missions, when necessary, as quickly as possible.

We need to have a clear-sighted view of what capabilities peacekeeping will need if it is to the meet the challenges ahead. Peacekeeping will need to be more mobile, flexible and adaptable. It will be important for the Security Council to address significant capacity gaps. With the recent establishment of the Office for Peacekeeping Partnership, we now have in place a further means of assessing the deployments of uniformed personnel, and we have a mechanism to identify areas that require adaptation and improvement, in partnership with Member States.

Ensuring effective command and control is another key challenge. When they choose to contribute a contingent to a particular operation, troop and police contributors should work with the mission leadership as one. We need cohesive and unified command structures, and we count on our troop and police contributors to work towards this common objective.

Finally, in addressing these new challenges, our engagement with regional organizations must continue to deepen and diversify. Arrangements that will allow us to draw more effectively from regional standby capacities could help us meet the need to respond rapidly in new and changing environments. We are engaged in a dialogue with the African Union, European Union and the Collective Security Treaty Organization to that end.

The continued use of United Nations peacekeeping by the Security Council testifies to its continuing relevance and its unique universality and legitimacy. The demand for peacekeeping will remain, but this has also raised concern as the global budget to support operations approaches $8 billion. We must be

responsible and accountable stewards of the financial and human resources entrusted to us.

But we should also recall that United Nations peacekeeping is a strong and effective tool that is protecting people, saving lives and helping countries to emerge from conflict. These effects are real and measurable. We must be prepared to make the necessary investments in peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and we must bring to bear the full range of tools at the disposal of the international community to consolidate peace and achieve an enduring political solution to conflicts wherever we are called to act.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

I now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda): Mr. President, allow me to start by congratulating you on your 40 years of dedication to diplomacy — an exceptional milestone that many of us will never reach and that speaks volumes of your great contributions to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Russia and international affairs. I wish you four more decades in Russian and international diplomacy. Given your vitality in the Council, I am convinced that you will easily reach that goal.

I would like to thank you, Sir, for convening this open debate on new trends in peacekeeping. As a dedicated troop- and police-contributing country for the past decade and as current Chair of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, Rwanda appreciates such inclusive interaction involving Council members, the larger United Nations membership and the United Nations leadership on this very timely and important topic. I also thank the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, for being here today and for his briefing.

While our discussion here today revolves around new trends such as robustness, new technology, inter-mission cooperation and multidimensional mandates, for the sake of brevity I will focus on three areas, namely, technology, robust peacekeeping and a few remarks on regional partnerships.

Rwanda has positively engaged in discussions on the introduction of new technology into peacekeeping theatres that could help to mitigate many threats faced by peacekeepers and civilians alike. As it has been presented, such technology has the potential to identify and monitor armed groups and arms trafficking, assist patrols heading into hostile territory, and assess the movement of displaced refugees. However, like other members here today, Rwanda shares valid concerns that need to be addressed in moving forward. Questions still exist regarding control of information collected, confidentiality and third-party impartiality.

The unmanned, unarmed aerial assistance being used in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is there on a trial basis. Once its achievements and efficacy on the ground are confirmed, then we can support its systemic integration into the requirements of peacekeeping mandates as the situation of a particular mission would dictate. In order for that to happen, however, a comprehensive and enforceable United Nations framework governing the collection and dissemination of drone-collected intelligence and data would be essential in mitigating public and regional concerns.

Given the nature of current threats to peacekeeping, Rwanda believes that the deployment of robust peacekeepers is essential not only to effectively protecting civilians, but also to their own protection in increasingly hostile and volatile environments. However, we cannot expect peacekeepers to engage in robust peacekeeping tasks without the necessary preparation and resources. If we do not have the ability to insert forces and to conduct casualty and medical evacuations or air lifts, then we have major problems and should not have deployed in the first place. Thus, in order for robust peace operations to work, the peacekeeping community must agree on the development of robust ideas at the strategic level and adequately prepare forces at the operational and tactical levels. In particular, it requires the timely provision of defence stores, strong regional stand-by capacities and the timely deployment of enablers.

Allow me to emphasize that while Rwanda supports well-prepared and well-planned robust peacekeeping when it is called for, we do not believe that peacekeepers have a role to play in asymmetric warfare. Rather, all stakeholders in the region must make a concerted effort to train and develop asymmetric warfare strategies. That being said, we should not continue to focus on military solutions and related strategies while losing track of the peaceful settlement of conflicts. We need political robustness now more than ever.

The challenges we have identified in all of these new trends in peacekeeping are related in any actual sense not to the Organization's ability or creativity in enhancing the performance of its mandates, but rather to the double standards related to using those good initiatives. It is absurd that there are those who use these advantages in the way they choose and only when it fits their interest.

How else can we explain that with the new technologies and the robust mandate of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), it has chosen to fight some armed groups, while ignoring others, such as the longest-surviving group in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo — the Forces démocratiques de libération du Rwanda (FDLR). I recall that the FDLR is a movement that committed genocide in my country 20 years ago and that has been terrorizing the Congolese people, raping women and girls, and recruiting children. It is a negative force that has been the cause of most other rebellions in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Whose interests are those supposedly good initiatives serving, while the people we are supposed to protect are still being raped and killed? Rwanda has called upon the Council many times to hold MONUSCO accountable. It is known by all that investing resources where there is no transparency and accountability is a waste of time and money and bleeds responsibility.

On regional partnerships, Rwanda believes that when talking about the strategic future of United Nations peace operations, we must consider the Organization's ability to function successfully with partners organizations that can share the burden and bring their own comparative advantages to the table. That is especially true on the African continent, where we have seen critical partnerships in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Darfur, Somalia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali and currently, South Sudan.

While the role of regional organizations is recognized in Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, the added value and increasing role they have gained in recent years requires less of an ad hoc process and a more of a streamlined framework within the United Nations peacekeeping architecture. This will take time, but it is essential to allowing us to cope with the inevitable challenges related to resources, preparedness and the political and operational aspects of cooperation. Next month during our Council presidency, Rwanda will convene a high-level open debate mainly to discuss the evolution of regional partnerships in peacekeeping. Their role in helping to secure international peace and security is rapidly expanding, and the status quo must be adapted to reflect that evolution.

Let me end by thanking the women and men who put their lives at risk in the name of international peace and security, and those who are no longer with us but whose sacrifice will never be forgotten. It is for their sake and for that of those whom they protect that we should strengthen our peacekeeping abilities.

Mr. Cherif (Chad) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Russian Federation for convening this open debate on new trends in the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. I would also like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for his briefing.

Peacekeeping operations are of great significance because they contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. Peacekeeping operations began in the 1940s. They have changed from traditional missions based on ceasefire monitoring to multidimensional ones with increasingly complicated tasks. In recent years, in addition to armed conflicts, there have been threats, such as terrorism and cross-border organized crime. The solutions have also changed. Sometimes that has led to contradictions with the fundamental principles of maintaining peace, namely, the consent of the parties, impartiality, and the non-use of force except in cases of self-defence or in defence of the mandate.

Chad is participating in four of the 16 peacekeeping operations across the world with more than 1,600 Blue Helmets, and has made significant sacrifices in subregional African peacekeeping operations and those of the United Nations. Chad's participation, while it may be modest, confirms its strong commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Three aspects of the trends in United Nations peacekeeping call for our attention: the issue of robust mandates; the intervention of international forces alongside and in support of peacekeepers; and the use of aerial surveillance systems, or unarmed pilotless drones.

In regard to United Nations participation in peace enforcement operations, in particular in offensive activities — for example, that authorized by resolution 2098 (2013), which created a rapid reaction force, the Force Intervention Brigade of the United Nations,

within the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) — Chad notes that the Intervention Brigade enabled the defeat of the Mouvement du 23 Mars and a return to security and stability in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo even if other negative forces, such as the Forces démocratiques de libération du Rwanda and the Allied Democratic Forces, continue to run rampant and pose an ongoing threat to the stability of the Great Lakes region. In that respect, we support the Secretary-General in his intention to create, as necessary, rapid intervention forces within certain United Nations operations in conflict areas where the protection of civilians poses a major challenge.

With respect to the intervention of parallel international forces alongside and in support of peacekeepers, in recent years we have seen such forces intervene in several conflicts. That situation is explained, on the one hand, by a lack of resources on the part of regional organizations and the weakness of the States concerned. The recent experience of the use of such parallel forces demonstrates that the Security Council mandates are not always used in line with the principles and requirements of the Organization. The existence of parallel international forces alongside peacekeepers sometimes creates overlap and confusion in the implementation of mandates and can lead to friction and competition in coordinating activities. Sometimes, parallel forces deployed in support of peacekeeping operations find themselves on the front lines and must take the upper hand over the peacekeeping operation mission. That is not conducive to unifying energies and actions.

The issues of effective joint efforts and ensuring consistency in mandates should be examined. That being so, we think that we should stress the use of a regional focus in the settlement of crises by strengthening the intervention capabilities of subregional and regional organizations, as those organizations provide an alternative, given that they are closer, faster and more flexible. The African Union Mission in Somalia and the former African-led Support Mission in Mali are concrete examples of the efforts of the African Union.

In regard to drones, the Secretary-General's report of 5 March (S/2014/153) provides the example of MONUSCO, where their use has provided that mission with strengthened capacities for intelligence, monitoring and surveillance. It has allowed for more effective action against illegal activities of armed groups, notably those involved in the trafficking of arms and precious minerals. Nevertheless, we would like to express our concern regarding an ongoing lack of clarity on the use of drones and the use of the information and images collected. The use of drones, whether armed or unarmed, raises concerns and questions, all of which should be duly addressed.

In conclusion, we reiterate our support for United Nations peacekeeping operations, as well as for the noble cause that the Blue Helmets defend. We pay tribute to all peacekeepers, including our compatriots, who have given their lives in the service of peace across the world. This discussion, given its importance, merits being followed up at the level of the Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. Llanos (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): We thank the presidency of the Russian Federation for convening this open debate and for the concept note (S/2014/384, annex) on a theme of importance and relevance to the Organization. We also thank the Secretary-General for his briefing.

Peacekeeping operations are an important tool in the work of the Organization under its peace and security pillar. The international recognition of that tool rests, in part, on its origin and the principles that inspire the missions, namely, impartiality, the consent of the parties and the non-use of force except in cases of self-defence or defence of the mandate.

Peacekeeping operations have changed from a traditional concept, basically serving the functions of observation, monitoring and reporting on ceasefires between and among States, to a scenario in which the conflict situations that occur are often intra-State and the operations are assigned multiple responsibilities. That has resulted in so-called multidimensional mandates, robust mandates or even, in some exceptional situations, the establishment of a force intervention brigade, as in the case of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This new scenario requires thorough analysis and discussion, which, as we see it, should be held with the entire United Nations membership, and in particular, with the troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries. In that regard, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of the General Assembly has a particular role to play.

My delegation favours a multidimensional focus as the approach to conflict resolution, since it transcends the mere cessation of hostilities and involves tasks that include the facilitation of political processes; the protection of civilians; the protection of human rights; the promotion and support of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; the restoration of the rule of law and the promotion of national reconciliation.

The complexity of such tasks demands that the Council provide clear, realistic mandates, along with sufficient resources for their attainment. Perhaps we should explore a structure that would, among other things, provide for strengthening the civilian component and an efficient comprehensive matrix for the remaining components, through which the United Nations agencies on the ground would be subordinate to the leadership of a given mission. Furthermore, we must develop more precise regulatory frameworks based on lessons learned. We stress the need to take effective steps to strengthen the focus on fully integrated missions. As we indicated earlier, we believe that it is important that those steps should arise from an interaction between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

We appreciate the Secretary-General's suggestion regarding a review of the peacekeeping operations under the Charter of the United Nations. With respect to the so-called robust mandates and intervention brigades, we share the President's concerns regarding to the principles of impartiality and consent. The use of force by the United Nations will always entail political implications and will always be susceptible to generating unforeseeable consequences. For that reason, political control of such decisions should be strengthened, and the mechanisms for their implementation should be precisely spelled out, paying special heed to the views of troop-contributing countries. Along those lines, the progressive development of international law demands the elaboration of clear and precise rules of engagement that take into account the new challenges involved and provide for appropriate mitigation measures.

The possible use of force should be determined by weighing such varied factors as mission capacity, public perception, humanitarian impact, staff security and protection and, most importantly, the impact of such actions on the national and local consensus with regard to the mission. Peacekeeping operations should be aimed at de-escalating violence on the ground and returning to forms of persuasion that do not involve the use of force. Should the use of force be authorized, we believe that neighbouring countries and countries of the subregion should not undertake the tasks that involve the use of force. It would seem desirable for individual units to have clearly defined and differentiated functions.

Whatever function is ultimately adopted, we stress the importance of reinforcing a gender perspective in all peacekeeping operations and of remaining vigilant so as to ensure that all ground operations include a gender component, as provided for in resolution 1325 (2000).

With regard to the use of new technologies, in particular the use of unarmed drones, my country supports the principle derived from the Brahimi report(S/2000/809) concerning the need to provide all peacekeeping operations with better information for the execution of their mandates, for developing and planning their specific tasks, and for evaluating their results. Drones are a good tool for accomplishing such tasks and, in principle, my country supports their use. However, we need to establish the legal framework for their use. In that regard, we propose the development of a legal study and the creation of a framework for their operational use to be submitted to member States for their review and approval.

Finally, with respect to cooperation between missions, my country sees peacekeeping operations as a flexible and useful tool in dealing with rapidly unfolding situations or as part of regional clusters. Nonetheless, norms in this instance should also be more precisely defined. Inter-mission cooperation must always emanate from a process of consultation and should be accompanied by the respective memorandums of understanding that fully document their legal grounds. The consent of troop-contributing countries is fundamental, along with the presentation of a status report on the situation of the contributing mission, as well as a clear definition of the mandate and the use of force in the receiving mission.

Peacekeeping and peacebuilding are among the permanent objectives of my country's foreign policy. We view the concept of peacekeeping operations as a broad one, involving both the maintenance and the promotion of peace—one whose civilian and military components should work in a coordinated fashion with an integrated focus. Only a focus of that nature is capable of maintaining the link between security

and development and of creating better conditions for preventing future conflicts.

As a troop-contributing country, we reiterate our commitment to the Organization in the noble task of contributing to peace and security.

Ms. Lucas (Luxembourg) (*spoke in French*): Luxembourg thanks the Russian Federation for taking the initiative to organize this debate on peacekeeping operations, an important topic that comes directly under the purview of the Security Council. I also thank the Secretary-General for his statement and for his personal commitment, within the context of his priorities under his mandate, to the task of building a strengthened partnership for peacekeeping and for enhancing the ability of the United Nations to ensure the protection of civilians.

I fully endorse the statement to be made by the observer of the European Union.

Since the deployment of military observers to monitor the truce in the Middle East in 1948, peacekeeping operations have been at the core of United Nations endeavours. They have constantly evolved in complexity and diversity. They have often been conducted in difficult environments where their role is no longer limited to overseeing a ceasefire or a simple line of demarcation. The Security Council recognized that shift when it adopted resolution 2086 (2013). In so doing, the Council defined more robust mandates for strengthening the protection of civilians.

On that basis, the Council decided, in adopting resolution 2098 (2013), to provide the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) with an intervention brigade in order to prevent the expansion of the armed groups in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and to neutralize and disarm them in a "robust, highly mobile and versatile manner". That strengthened mandate has already borne fruit against the Mouvement du 23 mars and other armed groups. It should continue to remain in force. In the case of MONUSCO, the implementation of that mandate has also made it possible to bolster the protection of civilians and thus to fill in some of the gaps in that area revealed by the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (A/67/787). The mandate itself is one thing. Those responsible for peacekeeping operations still need to have the will and the capability to implement their mandate.

In that context, I would like to stress the contribution of new technologies that can improve understanding of a given situation and thereby strengthen the safety and security of peacekeepers deployed in difficult terrain. A trial application has been in place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo since last December, with the deployment of drones under MONUSCO's mandate. Those drones also enable the Mission to monitor the movements of armed groups and thus to enhance the information available for military operations. In addition, they enable better surveillance of displaced-persons camps. The information thus obtained improves the Mission's effectiveness with respect to civilian security in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. That positive experience should encourage us to equip other United Nations operations with similar systems according to their needs.

I will not dwell on the theme of inter-mission cooperation. The temporary transfer of personnel and equipment from one operation to another to address a sudden deterioration in one situation is sometimes necessary in the short term. But the recent case of South Sudan has shown the limits of that approach. Without being able to significantly increase the resources of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), the Security Council was well advised, in adopting resolution 2155 (2014), to reframe the Mission's mandate by making the protection of civilians its top priority and authorizing UNMISS to utilize all necessary means to ensure the protection of civilians.

Peacekeeping operations have a crucial role to play in protecting highly vulnerable populations, especially women and children. It is also essential that we deploy capacities specifically dedicated to those tasks, particularly advisers on the protection of children and women. Nor should we forget that in the context of peacekeeping operations, Blue Helmets are often the first to deal with situations of violations concerning women and children or of violence towards them. The fate of those women and children depends largely on their ability to handle such situations properly.

Peacekeepers should therefore have specific training before and during their deployment to enable them both to cope with these situations and take the necessary decisions that arise. We welcome the fact that in resolution 2143 (2014), the Security Council recommended that the United Nations and troop- and police-contributing countries provide targeted and

operational training in order to prepare their staff to help prevent violations against children.

I would like to conclude by expressing Luxembourg's deep appreciation for the commitment of the peacekeepers, police officers and civilian staff who do a vital job, often in difficult conditions, in order to carry out the demanding mandates the Security Council entrusts to them. We pay homage to the memory of the more than 3,200 men and women who have given their lives since 1948 in performing their duties in the service of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. The best tribute we can give them is to learn the lessons of the past and to improve the tool we possess in peacekeeping operations, in the interests of the civilians those operations are mandated to protect, and to labour unceasingly to create the political conditions our Blue Helmets need to succeed.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his statement and the Russian presidency for taking the initiative to organize this debate among the Security Council, the Secretariat's peacekeeping officials and troop-contributing countries, whose commitment I take this opportunity to commend.

I associate myself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union.

I would like to make four points. First, despite some of the new contexts in which they are deployed, the role of peacekeeping operations is still to bring a peace process to a successful conclusion. There is no doubt that the classic situation — of a theatre of war where a peace agreement has already been signed by the time an operation deploys — is now an exception. More often than not we find ourselves in ambiguous situations that range from a tacit halt to hostilities to a ceasefire disputed by armed elements, but the challenge still lies in initiating and concluding a process that leads to a lasting peace. In that context, the role of a peacekeeping operation is simultaneously military — it must stabilize the security situation and deter potential troublemakers — and political, in supporting, facilitating and backing up a peace process, including by addressing the root causes of the conflict. One cannot work without the other.

Secondly, peacekeepers' operational priority must always be the protection of civilians. Civilians are the first victims of modern conflicts. Twenty years after the genocide in Rwanda and the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, the United Nations has made significant progress in putting the protection of civilians at the heart of peacekeeping operation mandates. In environments that are complex and, as the military put it, non-conducive, robust implementation of peacekeeping operation mandates, in general, and the protection of civilians, in particular, is essential. We have seen the relevance of this approach in the Democratic Republic of the Congo with the Force Intervention Brigade created within the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO). The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo also emphasizes the degree to which this approach depends, beyond its mandate, on a peacekeeping operation's management team, on the force's capacity and on the attitude of the troops deployed on the ground. In South Sudan today, everything should take a back seat to the need for the United Nations Mission in South Sudan to protect civilians.

Thirdly, peacekeepers should provide support to the host State's authorities while preserving the goal of achieving a transition that can consolidate its emergence from crisis. If a State is failed or fragile, peacekeepers can legitimately help to restore the State's authority and assist it, particularly with disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform and justice. That requires the United Nations to develop its expertise in those areas, at the very least in order to better coordinate international action and assist the authorities on the ground. That is a challenge that the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic will have to deal with when it deploys there.

Clearly, peacekeeping operations cannot and should not be a substitute for the efforts of countries themselves or of international donors. That is not their job. On the contrary, they must always be focused on enabling an emergence from crisis and re-establishing both the local authorities and the United Nations country teams at the heart of peacebuilding efforts. It is up to the Council to ensure that those efforts are reflected in its decisions, first of all, but also in the actions and the structure of the resulting operations, and in the renewal of every mandate, which should be not a routine matter but a tool for the dynamic management of a peacekeeping operation.

Fourthly, peacekeeping operations must be flexible as well as stronger. They have become major machines with staffs that can exceed 20,000. Deploying such organizations is a challenge, particularly in emergency situations. Its complexity is further complicated by the constraints imposed by certain resources, such as force multipliers, logistical support, military and civilian expertise, trained personnel — including in the area of languages — and, especially, funding.

In regard to the subject of languages, I would like to make my annual plea to the Secretariat — which I am doing as I reach the end of my term, without much hope of being heard — that it is perhaps more useful to have personnel who speak the language of the country concerned than the language of New York. In other words, in French-speaking missions it is perhaps more useful to recruit French speakers than people who can write reports to New York in English. We know perfectly well that the Secretariat does in fact make it a priority to choose English speakers.

At the other end of the spectrum, a peacekeeping operation must be adaptable in the peacebuilding phase too. It must be able to adjust its approach, adapt the size of its civilian staff and support the host State or the country team and donors in taking over responsibility. We should therefore step up our efforts to make peacekeeping operations more flexible in both directions. On the one hand, that means displaying an ability to deploy rapidly that is not always the case today, as the example of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali shows. On the other hand, a peacekeeping operation should be able to draw down its military personnel in order to restore to the host State its responsibilities, and it should be able to do it rapidly and to propose such action itself.

That flexibility also depends on making the best use of modern technologies. We welcome the experiments being done with the tactical use of surveillance drones within MONUSCO and soon, we hope, in other theatres too. They will enable us to ensure not only forces' security but also to economize on personnel. The recent presentation by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations on the first results of the experiments in the Democratic Republic of the Congo convinced us of their usefulness and relevance, and we should pursue them.

Inter-mission cooperation is another avenue. When unforeseen events threaten to destabilize a country, cooperation between missions is an appropriate response that can help missions that need them to strengthen troops and equipment in a timely way. We should pursue this line of attack further; this is about budgets as well as efficiency.

Our discussions today should enable peacekeeping operations to make advances that render them more robust, more flexible and able to create conditions that are conducive to successful political processes wthout making the countries concerned dependent on peacekeeping activities. France will continue its efforts in that direction within the Council. It will also continue to support the many initiatives on all such areas taken by the Secretariat, in particular, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, whether in drawing up mandates or considering strategic reviews or at regular briefings.

Like my colleague from Luxembourg, I cannot conclude without commending the commitment of peacekeepers of all nationalities, who sometimes pay with their lifes for their dedication in the service of peace. On this occasion, I would like to pay tribute to them.

Mr. Oh Joon (Republic of Korea): The Republic of Korea sincerely appreciates the initiative of the Russian presidency to organize today's open debate on new trends in peacekeeping operations. We are also grateful to the Secretary-General for his participation and insightful briefing.

Peacekeeping operations remain an essential tool for the Security Council to fulfil its responsibility to maintain international peace and security. However peacekeeping missions increasingly face diversified threats and multifaceted challenges. They are now evolving to better meet the new demands, including where there is no peace to keep, as described by the Secretary-General. It is therefore incumbent on the Council to seek prudent and realistic strategies to qualitatively upgrade United Nations peacekeeping operations.

The Republic of Korea, which accomplished post-war State reconstruction with the full support of the United Nations, attaches great importance to all United Nations peace efforts and has actively participated in peacekeeping operations as a troop-contributing country. Today, I would like to share some of our thoughts on how to achieve the proper balance between peacekeeping principles and the new demands.

First, regional and subregional ownership is crucial for peacekeeping operations to carry out robust mandates. In reality, impartiality does not guarantee the safety of peacekeepers and sometimes triggers anti-United Nations sentiments. The key in that regard is the clear and broad support given to a peacekeeping mission. The support granted to the Force Intervention Brigade in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to which the host Government consented at the explicit request of a regional body, is a good example.

Secondly, the quantitative expansion of peacekeeping operations should be balanced with the focused prioritization of mandates and the streamlining of staff. Clear, credible and achievable mandates enable missions to achieve their goals. The possible overlapping of roles of peacekeeping civilian components, the United Nations country team and other development partners should be avoided. Sequencing the deployment of troops, police and civilians is recommended, as in the case of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic, in particular when inactivity is expected in the case of simultaneous deployment.

Thirdly, inter-mission cooperation can benefit from past lessons. Recently, the experience of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan illustrates that such cooperation requires more time and greater costs than expected. Securing critical enablers is always a tremendous challenge. A prolonged crisis will test the capability of the dispatching missions and give rise to the option of a new force generation. To maximize the usefulness of inter-mission cooperation, we request that the Secretariat establish more systematic guidelines, taking into account all relevant factors, including a cost-benefit analysis and the scope of cooperation.

Fourthly, we believe that modernizing peacekeeping operations could provide solutions to some challenges that we face. Unarmed unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), for example, can monitor the movement of conflicting parties and help to prevent a possible crisis. The UAVs utilized by peacekeeping operations do not even need to be equipped with state-of-the-art technology. The use of UAVs can be cost effective and practical, especially in risky areas or those that are difficult to access. Efforts should be made to take political and legal concerns into account in meeting the requirement of respect for sovereignty, transparency and confidentiality. We look forward to the report of the expert panel organized by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support in that regard.

Fifthly, discussions related to peacekeeping operations in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly and the Security Council need to be linked with a view to enabling a comprehensive review of the military, legal, civilian and budgetary implications. We would like to propose that the Secretary-General establish a system-wide cooperation framework among peacekeeping operation-related entities and submit a comprehensive report on the direction of the development of such United Nations operations.

As the Secretary-General also pointed out, since the landmark Brahimi report of 2000 (S/2000/809), there has been a sea change in the environments where peacekeeping operatiosn carry out their mandates. It is true that the Security Council should carefully avoid burdening peacekeeping missions with tasks that exceed the principles of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. However, the role of a peacekeeping operation 10 years ago was different from that of today. It is natural to assume that its role 10 years from now will also go beyond today's boundaries to meet the upcoming challenges. We would therefore like to emphasize the importance of keeping an open mind to embracing the necessary changes.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I thank the President for having convened this open debate. I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his important introductory statement. Conflict has changed dramatically over the past 30 years and United Nations peacekeeping has struggled to keep up. It is therefore right that we consider the changes that we have seen and those that we would like to see.

Conflict today is less often inter-State and more predominantly internal, asymetric and multilayered. It is driven by a wide range of factors. Some of the most recurrent of those are economic and political exclusion, which denies a free future for all, corrupt or venal State institutions that curtail or abuse fundamental rights and freedoms, and untrustworthy or inept security apparatuses that favour one or other segment of society.

Addressing those complex and interwoven issues demands a more sophisticated peacekeeping response than before. In the past, we had one main model of peacekeeping, namely, an interposition force deployed

along some form of recognized, albeit perhaps disputed, boundary. The force created a physical and political space, in which a ceasefire could be solidified and a sustainable agreement negotiated. However, the most recent example of such a traditional force was the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea, authorized in September 2000. No United Nations peacekeeping operation established in the past 14 years follows that traditional pattern.

Today, there are at least seven different models of peacekeeping operations authorized by the United Nations. That is not a bad thing in itself. It shows that we are adapting but, of course, not all those models have proved to be equally effective. However, the move away from the so-called traditional model reflects the realities of today's world. Infantry battalions deployed to be largely static monitoring presences are not often able to respond adequately to the sophisticated threats and complex environments that we now face.

To ensure that peacekeepers can respond adequately to the new challenges, they need to have the necessary tools and capability to deliver the required effect. One such tool is inter-mission cooperation, enabling peacekeeping missions to share scarce resources when faced with sudden crises. Inter-mission cooperation should help missions to implement their mandates, not provide a pretext for protracted budget wrangling or questions about security.

Another tool is new technology aimed at supporting peacekeepers in the areas of protection, information gathering and intelligence analysis. That is a natural evolution and one that we should seize with both hands. For instance, unmanned unarmed aerial systems can be used to observe the area around an exposed patrol base and provide warning of the movement of armed groups in the base's direction. That information can then be used to deploy a rapid reaction force to deter any would-be attackers.

We have seen the positive impact that the deployment of such unmanned aerial systems has had in the Democratic Republic of the Congo as part of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I would like to acknowledge the Secretariat's drive and innovative thinking in delivering that impact. The use of such systems should be considered in other theatres where peacekeepers are expected to cover huge areas with limited numbers of personnel, such as in South Sudan and Mali.

At the heart of any peacekeeping operation is the mandate agreed by the Security Council. We have a responsibility to make sure that mandates are clear and not overloaded. We need better prioritized and sequenced mandates that promote an integrated military and civilian response. That requires discipline from everyone, including Security Council members. But it also requires an understanding that not everything needs to be included in the first phase or the first budget. We need to make clear the strategic goals of deploying a peacekeeping operation and what tasks we are asking peacekeepers to fulfil in order to achieve those goals. The overarching objective should be to try to sustain or create the conditions in which a lasting peace can be agreed between the warring parties and achieved by them or through external facilitation or mediation.

Exit strategies should be part of the discussion right from the start when mandates are negotiated. In many of today's conflicts that will mean prioritizing security and the protection of civilians in the early phases. Peacekeepers need therefore to be willing to take the necessary risks to protect civilians. Where the nature of the conflict demands, that should include conducting targeted offensive operations to neutralize and deter armed groups from threatening or attacking civilians.

Such robust action is not a radical departure from what the Council has been asking of peacekeeping missions with protection-of-civilian mandates for some years. One of our closest partners is the African Union, and that partnership has generated several models that we have collectively benefited from — in Somalia, Central African Republic and Mali. Quick deployment and a readiness to adopt a robust posture and to use force in pursuit of the mandate give us other important tools in the peacekeeping toolbox.

Sadly, it is clear that we will continue to need peacekeeping operations for the foreseeable future. To ensure that United Nations peacekeeping is effective, we need to remain flexible in how we mandate missions, taking advantage of capabilities offered through new technology, using scarce resources intelligently across missions and working in partnership with those ready and willing to address new conflicts. We should not waste time trying to codify the ever-changing peacekeeping landscape. That risks limiting how we respond to conflict through an institutionalization of our response. Doing so would be a sure way to constrain our freedom of action and a sure way to fail in responding to the next conflict.

We owe it to the people of the world suffering in conflict situations to maintain as effective a response as possible, and we owe it to the peacekeepers to provide them with the tools and clarity they need to do their jobs effectively, jobs that they willingly and bravely undertake on behalf of the international community in the pursuit of international peace and security. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to them.

Ms. Murmokaitė (Lithuania): I thank you, Sir, for organizing this highly pertinent open debate. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive briefing.

Lithuania associates itself with the statement to be delivered on behalf of the European Union by the Head of its Delegation to the United Nations.

Since the inception of the United Nations, peacekeeping has developed to become an indispensable tool for the maintenance of international peace and security. Nearly 70 missions have been deployed over that time, and the experience and lessons learned from those missions continue to feed into the concept of peacekeeping as it evolves further, owing to the changing nature of conflicts and the requirements on the ground. While today's trends in peacekeeping can pose considerable challenges, they also highlight the inherent adaptability of United Nations peacekeeping, which remains one of its major strengths.

Today, let me focus on three issues: ensuring capabilities needed to implement peacekeeping mandates, inter-mission cooperation, and the use of modern technologies.

Former United Nations Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld once noted that "peacekeeping is not a job for soldiers, but only soldiers can do it". Owing to the multidimensional character of today's peacekeeping, the troops on the ground must be able to respond quickly to the multiple challenges at hand. Besides traditional peacekeeping tasks, they must provide effective protection of civilians and their human rights, humanitarian assistance, and, in cooperation with country teams and relevant regional and subregional actors, engage in early peace- or State-building. That raises new demands for the peacekeeping partnership of the Security Council, Member States, the Secretariat and the relevant regional organizations.

Highly mobile units and task forces with appropriate equipment and sustainability capabilities are increasingly preferable to traditional infantry battalions, which are best suited to operate in static configurations. Approaches that integrate infantry, police and gendarmerie, engineering and support structures are being tested in real time. The operational readiness of troops and their preparedness for rapid deployment are an increasing necessity. A capability-driven and qualitative rather than quantitative focus must be maintained in order to ensure the effectiveness and operational value of peacekeeping forces in the highly volatile and rapidly changing crisis situations in which peacekeepers carry out their missions today.

Such complex, multidimensional environments also raise new demands for peacekeeper training and readiness to perform an increasing variety of tasks. Being able to read the signals of and act accordingly to deal with gender-based violence, rape as a tool of war, and the abuse and recruitment of children is key for implementing protection-of-civilian mandates. Because of the increasing focus on civilian protection and humanitarian issues, human rights and gender sensitivity training is essential for peacekeepers to be able to carry out their tasks properly.

Predeployment assessment is critical for ensuring that peacekeeping contingents meet United Nations standards, including with regard to the protection of civilians. Even more importantly, all personnel must respect the values of United Nations peacekeeping and, first of all, the principle of "do no harm". All allegations of misconduct involving peacekeeping personnel, in particular those related to sexual exploitation or abuse, must be examined thoroughly, and those responsible must be brought to account. A zero-tolerance policy with regard to sexual misconduct, wherever and whenever it occurs, must be strictly implemented.

Let me now turn to inter-mission cooperation. While the concept paper (S/2014/384, annex) notes that inter-mission cooperation should not affect the implementation of particular mission mandates, we believe that such cooperation could in fact help their implementation and should therefore be an inherent feature of overall mission planning. As crises multiply and the United Nations peacekeeping budget keeps growing, we believe that peacekeeping should not be seen as a patchwork of separate missions, but as a global enterprise in which efficiency gains and synergies should be identified so as to provide added value and benefit for all mandates. Broader regional and operational theatre thinking and assessment of crisis situations and conflict trends should take place,

possibly going as far as preparing contingency plans for inter-mission support, the involvement of regional and subregional actors, and options for emergency redeployment in crisis situations.

Emergency redeployment to tackle the situation in South Sudan, which has involved missions in volatile situations, can offer a valuable case study for the future. Cases of inter-mission cooperation in West Africa and the Middle East can also serve as examples, while opportunities for greater cooperation at the regional level are explored. At the same time, cooperation should also be strengthened on the global level, notably through the implementation of the Global Field Support Strategy and the use of the capabilities available at global and regional service centres.

Finally, let me touch upon the use of advanced technologies in United Nations peacekeeping. Lately, discussions at the United Nations have focused on unmanned aerial vehicles, whose added value was recently demonstrated at a Secretariat briefing on their use in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, the range of advanced technology that is or could be used to enhance implementation of the complex peacekeeping tasks of today is much wider. Global positioning system technology in mission vehicles, infrared capabilities on aircraft and helicopters, the reduction of missions' ecological footprint through water-saving equipment, and the use of cellular or satellite communications as early warning mechanisms by civilians in conflict areas are just some examples.

Technology can be employed not just to enhance situational awareness and facilitate the decision-making process, but also to bring peacekeepers closer to the communities they are mandated to protect. It is also important to reinforce the deterrence element, shrinking the space in which perpetrators can act undetected and with impunity. Finally, the use of advanced technology could result in substantial resource efficiencies and would allow the United Nations to optimize the use of critical enablers.

At the same time, technology cannot replace troops and police officers on the ground and should be seen as only performing an enabling and supporting role. Situational awareness without adequate troop capability to act is of little use. The human factor remains crucial in peacekeeping operations. Besides helping to better protect civilian lives, a smart use of technologies in peacekeeping would also help to protect the lives of peacekeepers, as the toll of peacekeeper deaths is becoming unacceptably high.

Only a short while ago, on 29 May, the United Nations marked the International Day of United Nations Peacekeepers. Let me conclude by paying tribute and expressing our deep appreciation and respect for all the peacekeepers, who put their lives at risk to protect the lives of others and, at times, pay the ultimate price in the line of duty.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation thanks the delegation of the Russian Federation for organizing this topical debate. We are especially appreciative of the concept note (S/2014/384, annex) provided to guide our discussions today, and we welcome the opportunity to share our perspectives on this very timely subject. We also want to take this opportunity to thank the Secretary-General, not only for his statement, but especially for his abiding commitment to peacekeeping.

The concept note that you have provided, Mr. President, identifies at least six distinct new trends in peacekeeping, and I would like to mention them in their order: the nature of conflicts, which is changing from inter-State to intra-State; robust mandates characterized by the use of pre-emptive force and targeted offensive operations; the deployment of United Nations peacekeeping operations in parallel with foreign military forces, both national and regional; the technical strengthening of United Nations peacekeeping operations through the use of high-technology equipment; the operational strengthening of United Nations peacekeeping operations through inter-mission cooperation; and the greater complexity of contemporary multidimensional mandates.

Since the end of the cold war in the 1990s, United Nations peacekeeping operations have undergone substantial changes from the classical concept of peacekeeping, which entailed impartiality, a non-combative posture, intervening with the consent of the warring parties and the prior existence of a peace agreement or ceasefire. That is principally because, in the post-cold-war era, conflicts have moved from being largely inter-State to being intra-State. The nature of those intra-State conflicts is such that there is often no ceasefire or peace agreement in place before a peacekeeping operation is deployed. The dynamics of the conflict make it difficult or indeed impossible to achieve a ceasefire.

As those conflicts often present a threat to international peace and security, the international community cannot be bystanders without taking action. That has led to a situation where, as indicated in the concept note, peacekeeping operations have been deployed in theatres with elevated risks, where there is little or no peace to keep and where peacekeepers face unconventional threats and greater risks to their safety. In such situations, the classical model of peacekeeping would prove inadequate and almost ineffective.

A major concern arising from the new trends in United Nations peacekeeping operations relates to the well-being of peacekeepers, who have been increasingly subjected to harsh and risky conditions while they are required to serve as a protective force. In several instances, troops and their civilian counterparts have been fired upon, abducted or ambushed. Some have, in the course of carrying out their mandates, had their weapons seized and yet others have been killed by armed groups. Peacekeepers have also been attacked through the use of improvised explosive devices.

The changing dynamics in the peacekeeping environment and the concerns of troop- and police-contributing countries for the safety of their personnel have led to the approval of more robust mandates for peacekeeping operations. That is illustrated in the adoption of resolutions 1933 (2010), 2098 (2013) and 2100 (2013), which respectively empowered the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI), the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) to undertake pre-emptive measures to fulfil their mandates, including the use of force. The robust mandates given to peacekeeping missions exemplify the Council's determination to meet the new challenges in peacekeeping operations.

One significant new trend in peacekeeping is the deployment of United Nations peacekeeping operations in parallel with foreign military forces already on the ground. The military forces may be from one country or may be deployed by a regional organization involving personnel from its member States. Examples of that can be seen in Mali, where French forces have been deployed since January 2013 under Operation Serval. The United Nations peacekeeping force MINUSMA was later deployed in July 2013 to replace the African-led International Support Mission in Mali and operates side by side with the French forces under separate commands. Resolution 2100 (2013), which established MINUSMA, authorized the French forces under Operation Serval to intervene, upon the request of the Secretary-General, in support of MINUSMA when the Mission is under serious and imminent threat. Thus far, MINUSMA and the French forces have worked together to restore peace to areas previously seized by rebel groups, and in the process, they have made very significant progress in the protection of civilians, which is a primary concern for the Council.

Another example of where a United Nations peacekeeping operation will be working in parallel with regional forces is in the Central African Republic. In that case, the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), which was established by resolution 2149 (2014) of April 2014 to replace the African-led International Support Mission in the Central African Republic (MISCA) on 15 September 2014, will work side by side with Operation Sangaris, made up of French forces. Operation Sangaris has been deployed in the Central African Republic since December 2013 with the aim of working with MISCA to restore security, protect civilians and stabilize the humanitarian situation in the Central African Republic. When MINUSCA is eventually deployed, in September 2015, Operation Sangaris will have been on the ground for nine months. The particular situation in Central African Republic is that MINUSCA will also have to work in parallel with another international force, namely the European Union force, which is made up of personnel from France and Estonia.

One of the new trends in United Nations peacekeeping operations is the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), or drones. While some members have concerns about the use of UAVs in peacekeeping missions, we believe that modern technology should rightly be considered as we seek solutions to the evolving challenges of peacekeeping. We share the view of Under-Secretary-General Ladsous that the United Nations cannot continue to work with twentieth-century tools in the twenty-first century.

As has been noted, drones could be use to reduce the risk on the ground for United Nations peacekeepers. That is significant when we consider the fact that 106 United Nations peacekeepers died in 2013, and another 22 civilians lost their lives, while serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations. According to the

United Nations, an average of one United Nations peacekeeper is killed every 30 days. UAVs could make it possible to reduce the number of peacekeepers on the ground. The implication of that is that it could also potentially help to reduce the number of peacekeepers and civilians killed in peacekeeping missions.

Another critical way in which drones could contribute to making peacekeeping operations more effective is in the area of surveillance. A drone operating silently at several thousand metres above the ground can observe and transmit images in real time to its controllers on the ground. That translates into real-time information, which in certain circumstances could allow for the kind of rapid response that makes the difference between life and death or allow for monitoring the movements of combatants in conflict situations. Drones could also help in the protection of civilians, especially those displaced by conflict. The benefits derived from the use of drones, in our view, make the case for their sustained application in the context of peacekeeping operations.

Inter-mission cooperation has been aptly described as a tool that enables the United Nations to fill critical gaps in personnel and/or equipment in situations, such as humanitarian crisis or other emergencies. That has been the practice since June 2005 when the Security Council adopted resolution 1609 (2005), which authorized the temporary redeployment of personnel between the peacekeeping operations in Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire and Liberia. Subsequently, the Council approved inter-mission cooperation in resolution 1951 (2010) of November 2010 between the United Nations Mission in Liberia and UNOCI and resolution 1650 (2005) between the United Nations Operation in Burundi and MONUC in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In recent times, we have seen units redeployed to the United Nations Mission in South Sudan from United Nations peacekeeping operations in Haiti, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Darfur within the framework of inter-mission cooperation.

While acknowledging the progress that has been made by the United Nations, we believe that a coherent standardized training programme for current and prospective peacekeeping contingents on inter-mission cooperation is very essential to overcoming the challenges in inter-mission cooperation and to ensure that all forces have a common understanding of their critical role in the process.

United Nations peacekeeping mandates have transformed from simple ceasefire monitoring and have become multidimensional. That in effect requires peacekeeping operations to carry out multiple tasks usually under very challenging circumstances. Those tasks, as we know, range from disarmament, demobilization and reintegration to peacebuilding, nation-building, the setting up of institutions of rule of law, the strengthening of human rights protection, the protection of civilians, the promotion of democracy and good governance, as well as promoting security sector reforms. Peacekeeping operations are now staffed with child protection advisers, gender advisers, experts in planning elections and a broad range of other personnel with expertise in various fields. In light of the resource constraints faced by peacekeeping operations, it would seem logical for the United Nations to prioritize the various mandates in a multidimensional operation and accord the greatest priority to the most urgent and attainable tasks.

Experience shows that multidimensional peacekeeping operations face challenges in terms of the technical expertise required to comprehensively implement effective peacebuilding programmes. Achieving that will require that efforts are undertaken by troop-contributing countries to conduct specific training and scenario-based exercises aimed at enhancing the capacity of multidimensional peacekeeping missions to deliver on peacebuilding programmes. We endorse the view that there should be a sequencing of tasks in multidimensional missions with the utmost priority accorded to the most important mandate of peacekeepers, which is the protection of civilians.

We believe that the time is ripe for a deepening synergy between the Security Council and United Nations Member States, particularly the troop- and police-contributing countries, for a more cohesive mandate design. We take this opportunity to pay tribute to peacekeeping personnel who have lost their lives in United Nations peacekeeping operations. We are in their great debt, and the greatest tribute we believe we can pay them is to attempt to beat our swords into plowshares.

Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein (Jordan): I thank you, Sir, for organizing this thematic discussion on "United Nations peacekeeping operations: negotiationsew trends". It is the right time for the Security Council to have such a debate and the concept

note (S/2014/384, annex) is really excellent. In one way, it is too excellent, for it raises so many fundamental points, the sum of which would require well over a week's worth of discussion, which we do not have time for. We also thank the Secretary-General for his clear analysis this morning and salute Under-Secretary-General Ladsous for his leadership of the Department.

I have the honour to disagree most respectfully with many of the arguments presented by my colleagues this morning. I would like to begin by dispelling certain myths about United Nations peacekeeping. It is a myth, for example, to state that United Nations peacekeeping today is more complex than it was in the 1960s or 1990s. It is also a myth to state that the Force Intervention Brigade is a new feature in United Nations peacekeeping. It is a myth to state that classic peacekeeping was inter-State while current peacekeeping is intra-State. It is also a myth for us to believe that more civilians are killed now in conflicts than in the past.

The reality is that the environments facing the United Nations in the 1960s — in the Congo, for example — or in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990s were no simpler then than those we face today, and the United Nations Operation in the Congo, the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor were just as complex as anything we have now.

Secondly, the recently created Force Intervention Brigade is almost exactly the same as the rapid reaction force in Bosnia and Herzegovina, created by resolution 998 (1995). The only difference being one of presentation, not of substance: the rapid reaction force was created "to enable UNPF/UNPROFOR to carry out its mandate" (*resolution 998 (1995), para. 9*), while resolution 2098 (2013) authorizing the establishment of the Force Intervention Brigade refers specifically of neutralizing armed groups. The effect was largely the same, however. An add-on to an existing peacekeeping operation, ostensibly founded on Chapter VI principles, but increasingly becoming Chapter VII in orientation, was employed to pursue — for reasons entirely justified — a specific party to the conflict. The routes were slightly different in appearance, but the destination was the same.

Finally, while there once was a preponderance of classic missions, the most demanding challenges facing the United Nations from 1948 onward were in conflicts not of an international character. Also contrary to popular perception, civilians have always borne the brunt of the casualties in war, from the time of Herodotus onward. The only exception being the First World War and even in that war, when the civilian deaths caused subsequently by the influenza outbreak are factored in, the numbers were huge.

So what is the current trend? The current trend is a repetition of previous cycles in peacekeeping, only the challenges posed by transnational organized crime and international terrorism accentuate the overall demands on peacekeeping, as the concept note correctly implies, and yet the means to address them are diminishing.

At the heart of our growing incapacity is this unfortunate fact — fewer countries than ever before are willing to field troops and formed police units for peacekeeping duty with commanders who are ready to take extreme risks, even if the cause — such as protecting civilians — is noble. In more specific terms, fewer countries than was the case 20 years ago, will accept casualties when there is no direct national interest at stake for the contributor. And almost all contributors will interfere in United Nations operations when the situation becomes markedly more dangerous than normal.

And when the challenges posed by a group like the Mouvement du 23 mars mount, we are forced to reconsider add-ons again, like the Force Intervention Brigade, and ponder in other cases whether we should contract private security firms, simply because there is little willingness by a growing number of troop-contributing countries to take extreme risks.

But even when we establish a force intervention brigade, legal questions abound, and questions raised 20 years ago return to the fore, about whether a peacekeeper acting under an initial Chapter VI mandate, and who is considered to be a civilian and therefore, in legal terms, a protected person under international humanitarian law, should also be in a force, part of which — the brigade — is given, under Chapter VII, the authority to use military force aggressively. Both the Rapid Reaction Force and the Force Intervention Brigade were successful in fulfilling their intended roles, yet these so-called Chapter VI 1/2 mandates still need an intense discussion.

Years ago, many of us felt that the blending of chapters was inadvisable from a security standpoint, and was also legally very problematic. We believed instead that certain Chapter VI mandates needed agreed triggers built into them, which, if tripped, would

switch the geometry completely into Chapter VII. The TCCs would know this before they joined the operation and would be prepared for, and have accepted, that possibility. The Council and the General Assembly, particularly the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, need to re-enter this discussion.

Here, I would like to state that it is disastrous the Special Committee cannot agree anymore on outcomes. I served for several years on the Committee and it was never like this. We have to do better and discuss these fundamental issues with a view to reaching agreement. The same can be said of the Fifth Committee and the troop reimbursement rate to TCCs, based upon General Assembly resolution 67/261 and the figure derived from the survey (A/68/813 and A/68/859).

Returning to the need for us to adopt a new operating calculus for how we delineate surgically between consent and enforcement, even were this to be possible, if large numbers of TCCs are not willing to accept casualties there is little we can usefully discuss. The increasing unwillingness to accept high risk has also, in part, led the United Nations to think of using modern technologies, such as unmanned aerial observation platforms. My delegation supports this initiative, and we commend the Department of Peacekeeping Operations for it.

But we all need to analyse this together very carefully. When Dag Hammarskjöld first heard, in a discussion with leaders in the Middle East on 27 August 1958, the term "a United Nations presence", he instinctively knew how he could develop it further. He understood better than anyone else that there were more alternatives to peacekeeping than simply a stark choice between either the deployment of United Nations battalions or the sending of an observer mission. The presence of only one official in theatre, with a small office, meant to Hammarskjöld that the entire United Nations was there as a whole. But, crucially, this presence required skilled humans to fill the void — to make the United Nations felt.

The lessons from the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan must be borne in mind, in this regard. It was a military observer mission established in 1994 with only 40 unarmed military observers deployed in Tajikistan, and yet it was credited in the first two years with saving a very large number of lives, and potentially the country altogether, simply by being everywhere. Whenever a situation grew critical in one remote corner or another and demanded the observers be there — day or night, hail or snow — somehow they were always there.

So what is needed most for a successful peacekeeping operation is not just the best equipment or the best-trained soldiers, and not even modern fighting units equipped with artillery and tanks. What is needed, above everything else, are remarkable field commanders and field officers. Every United Nations peacekeeping operation deployed in a dangerous theatre needs the very best company and battalion commanders. They must be fearless, or at least show no fear. They must know what military honour is; have a clear understanding of their mandate, the concept of operations and their rules of engagement; and know that their supreme duty is to protect civilians when required to do so. Every time civilians are deserted by the United Nations, rather than protected, not only do the civilians tend to suffer, but of course the United Nations credibility takes a body blow. These body blows, rather disturbingly, seem to be accumulating, as the recent report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (A/68/787) shows us.

We should perhaps have a field commanders academy, which instills in young commanders the sort of leadership that could be required of them. With the right commanders, and with us the Member States willing to accept more risk ourselves on behalf of the Organization, we can better ensure that United Nations peacekeeping will remain the flagship activity of the Organization.

Ultimately, if we do not accept the risks, we believe that Sir Brian Urquhart was right all those many years ago when he argued that if the Member States could not do it, the United Nations might need its own a standing force — a force that knew how to carry out the very mandate set for it by the Council, and which would not be subject to the influences and whims of the Member States, and whether they decided to participate or not, and if they participated presented countless caveats. This may still be radical thinking to some, yet inevitably we are headed in that very direction if the threats to international peace and security expand. We very much believe, therefore, that we need to discuss more seriously Urquhart's still profound thoughts in the months ahead.

Mr. DeLaurentis (United States of America): I thank you, Sir, for convening this debate to discuss the critically important issue of peacekeeping. I thank the Secretary-General for his opening statement.

As we meet, nearly 100,000 peacekeepers and 17,000 civilian personnel are deployed in peacekeeping missions around the world. Day after day, they put their lives on the line to protect people from communities and nations different from their own and to uphold the fundamental principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations. The United States thanks those individuals for their service, as well as the 122 countries from which they come.

Let me begin by saying that, on many of the issues involved in peacekeeping, we all agree on the key points. We agree that peacekeeping is an absolutely essential part of the Council's work and driven by our shared moral commitment to protecting the defenceless from the scourges of war and conflict. This sense of shared purpose is also driven by our having witnessed the horrific human consequences of the times when the United Nations has failed to stop the slaughter of unarmed civilians.

This year, we are marking the twentieth anniversary of the Rwandan genocide; next year we will do the same for Srebrenica. Rwanda and Srebrenica taught the world and the United Nations an extremely costly but important lesson. In order to fulfil their basic duty to protect civilians, peacekeepers need clear, robust mandates. This is another of the points on which we all can agree, and on which we have agreed repeatedly in the mandates for peacekeeping missions authorized since that time. Indeed, many of the current peacekeeping missions have robust mandates empowering them to use force to protect human lives.

However, that does not mean that peacekeeping missions should rely predominantly on the use of force to protect civilians. As is affirmed by resolution 2086 (2013), which the Council unanimously supported, effective peacekeeping is multidimensional peacekeeping. That means that we must use all of the tools in our tool box to prevent situations in which the use of force is necessary to save lives, and work methodically to lay the foundations for greater peace and stability.

All of that said, in circumstances in which force is necessary to protect innocent lives missions must fulfil the responsibilities set out by these robust mandates. In fact, the credibility of all of our commitments around the world to protecting civilians — which can be a deciding factor in determining the behaviour of those who would otherwise attack civilians — is inextricably tied to our living up to our word in each and every mission. As such, the failure to hold to this commitment in one mission can undermine the legitimacy of all of the others.

We have seen that these more robust approaches can be highly effective. The accomplishments of the Force Intervention Brigade in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo demonstrate that clearly. The success of that initiative truly has many fathers and mothers, from the region that put forward the idea of a neutral force focused primarily on combatting armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to the mandate that represents our collective commitments, to the contributing countries Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania, and to the troops who have performed so bravely and professionally on the ground in extremely challenging conditions. This effort has not only made the individual peacekeeping mission more effective and more credible, but also supported broader efforts to promote peace and stability in the Great Lakes region.

If we agree that we have a moral imperative to protect people at risk; if we have learned that peacekeeping missions need robust mandates to fulfil that commitment; and if we have unanimously authorized missions with such mandates, the question then is how we can give those robust missions the tools they need to be as effective as possible.

First, we in the Security Council need to set forth clear priorities in mandates, particularly through the sequencing of tasks — not because we think that some goals are less important than others, but rather because our experience has demonstrated that certain objectives cannot be pursued until others have been met. For example, it is difficult to rebuild a broken judiciary when it is not safe enough for people to leave their homes. Such prioritization will make missions more effective and more efficient. The Council's newest peacekeeping mission, the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic, offers a solid example of the Council's efforts to set such priorities, as well as proof of its benefits.

In addition, now that we have clearer, more robust mandates, we must do a better job of ensuring that missions have the capabilities needed to fulfil them. Among those necessary capabilities we count access to new technology, from wireless radios and satellite phones to unmanned, unarmed aerial vehicles. We believe that those best suited to determine what

capabilities are required are the missions themselves, and specialists from the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. To move such decision-making to the Council would not only take it away from the experts who know best, but also would dramatically hinder and politicize the process of obtaining crucial capabilities required to implement Council mandates and save lives.

Another way we can make missions more effective is to allow for greater inter-mission cooperation. We have seen how that can be a smart way to temporarily move resources rapidly to respond to emergencies and scale up missions on short notice, as Council members unanimously authorized in South Sudan, through resolution 2132 (2013). The more flexible such arrangements are, the more swiftly we will be able to respond to the next unexpected crisis.

Lastly, I would like to highlight an additional issue related to peacekeeping that deserves our attention. In March, the Office of Internal Oversight Services released a report on the protection of civilians in peacekeeping missions, focusing specifically on the use of force to protect civilians. Its key finding is that in United Nations peacekeeping operations, "force is almost never used to protect civilians under attack" (*A/68/787, para. 79*). The report highlights a number of apparent reasons for the failure to use force to protect civilians, as well as recommendations for how to address that.

While recognizing that the use of force is only one tool for protecting civilians, my Government believes that the Council would benefit from a thorough briefing of the report's serious and concerning conclusions. The Council would also benefit from a discussion of the report's implications for our work going forward. At its essence, the report reveals a significant gap that has emerged between the commitments we set down on paper — which constitute a responsibility to act — and the way that missions perform in practice. The larger that gap grows, the more vulnerable civilians become and the less credible the Organization and the peacekeepers that represent it become.

I hope that this is another point on which we can all agree and that today's discussion will contribute to the Council's work to make peacekeeping more efficient and effective.

Mr. Wang Min (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation appreciates the Russian initiative to convene today's open debate. I thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for his briefing.

United Nations peacekeeping operations, as an important United Nations tool in the maintenance of international peace and security for over six decades, have significantly contributed to the settlement of conflicts and disputes, and the restoration and building of peace. Meanwhile, given the changing nature of conflicts and disputes in recent years, the concept and practices of peacekeeping operations have displayed new trends and characteristics.

How can United Nations peacekeeping operations fulfil evolving requirements, grow in effectiveness and better promote political settlements, while ensuring a stable and sustainable security environment for peace consolidation and peacebuilding? The subject merits the international community's in-depth consideration within a peacebuilding framework. I wish to focus on the following five points.

First, continued adherence to the guiding principles of peacekeeping — that is, the parties' consent, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defence or implementation of the mandate — is fundamental to winning the confidence and support of Member States for peacekeeping operations and ensuring their smooth conduct. China approves of innovations and improvement in certain peacekeeping practices, in the light of current developments and realities, but the basic principles are key to ensuring the healthy development of such operations and should be upheld over the longer term. Any practice that deviates from or weakens those principles will hamper the operation's impartiality and objectivity and, worse yet, could transform the United Nations into a party to conflict, thereby undermining the conflict resolution efforts of the international community.

Secondly, in implementing peacekeeping mandates, United Nations peacekeeping missions should strictly abide by the Council's resolutions and fully respect the leading role of the countries in question. The deployment of peacekeeping missions is not a goal in itself and cannot substitute for the responsibilities and obligations of the host Government and the parties to the conflict concerning the protection of civilians. Such missions should instead focus on promoting peace and stability in conflict situations through political settlement and reconciliation processes, and on helping the countries

in question effectively to assume their responsibilities for the protection of their own nationals.

Thirdly, it is very important to ensure the dovetailing of peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts and to consolidate the fruits of those efforts in order to ensure lasting peace and stability. In determining the mandates of peacekeeping operations, the Council should attach priority to the urgent need for security and stability, while focusing on long-term perspectives by taking into account the current realities of the country in question, strengthening coordination between peacebuilding and peacekeeping, and strengthening the country's capacities, while ensuring a smooth transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding through a realistic and practical exit strategy.

Fourthly, strengthening the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations requires continuous improvements in scope and management. Nearly half of peacekeeping missions now comprise over 10,000 troops. Many missions are deployed in increasingly complex environments. An effective response to the resource and equipment challenges faced by the operations requires improved management and efficient use of resources. Through inter-mission cooperation and other means — including the rationalization of resource allocation in the light of developments on the ground and the timely adjustment of the scale and mandate of the mission — the Security Council, the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat should strengthen their coordination and collaboration and work together to ensure the smooth deployment of peacekeeping operations and the implementation of their mandates.

The wider use of unmanned aerial vehicles and other advanced technologies in peacekeeping operations will require in-depth study and discussion by Member States on its legal implications and operational management.

Fifthly, great attention and support should be given to the important role of the African Union (AU) and other regional and subregional organizations in the maintenance of peace and security in Africa. Today, more than half of United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed in Africa. The United Nations and the international community should increase their coordination and cooperation with African regional organizations in the field of peacekeeping operations, increase their support to the AU and other regional organizations so as to help Africa build its peacekeeping capabilities, and give full play to the advantages of the AU and other regional organizations in peacekeeping operations.

China is a firm supporter of and participant in United Nations peacekeeping operations, and we have over the years contributed a total over 20,000 peacekeepers. As the largest troop-contributing country among the permanent members of the Security Council, we have at present more than 2,000 peacekeepers serving in 10 peacekeeping operations. For the first time, we have deployed a security troop to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali and are ready to raise the number of our troops deployed in the United Nations peacekeeping operation in South Sudan, thereby making a bigger contribution to the restoration of peace and stability in South Sudan in the nearest future.

China will continue its active participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations, and is ready to work with the international community in contributing to the further development of peacekeeping operations and the maintenance of international peace and security.

Ms. King (Australia): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this important debate. We also thank the Secretary-General for his briefing and for his tireless efforts to build a flexible and sustainable United Nations peacekeeping force, able to respond not only to the challenges of today but also to anticipate those of the future.

Peacekeeping is at the very core of the United Nations. We are all indebted to those who have served as United Nations peacekeepers, and my country acknowledges those who have given their lives in pursuit of this noble cause. Over the past seven decades, 1 million Blue Helmets have deployed in over 70 operations across four continents, serving with distinction to prevent the outbreak of conflict, manage and contain violence and support countries in building peace after conflict.

As we have heard this morning, including from the Secretary-General, much has changed over the years in terms of the context for United Nations peacekeeping operations, yet the essential purpose of peacekeeping has remained the same, as have many of the means that peacekeepers employ to achieve their purpose. Let us take, for example, the proactive use of force. The United Nations has a history of using offensive action to counter threats. The solemn phrase "by all necessary means" has featured in mandates over many years as

a powerful statement of the Council's intent to uphold international peace and security.

As the Ambassador of Jordan has referenced, as far back as 1961 the United Nations Operation in the Congo launched offensive operations against Katangese forces. One could argue that this was the genesis of multidimensional peacekeeping. In Sierra Leone in 2000, troops of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone engaged in combat operations against the Revolutionary United Front. Special forces, artillery and attack helicopters were used in that operation — the same capabilities being employed to excellent effect by the Force Intervention Brigade of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) today, with strong support from the Council.

The protection of civilians is now rightfully established as a central tenet of United Nations peacekeeping, reflected in the fact that the majority of the Council's peacekeeping missions are clearly and specifically mandated to protect civilians. The Secretary-General's pronouncement in April that United Nations peacekeepers should not wait for instruction from Headquarters before taking action to protect civilians was an unambiguous directive affirming the need for proactive force measures for that specific purpose. We must all now work to ensure that the intent of the Council and the commitment of the Secretary-General are operationalized effectively to the benefit of the civilians who require protection.

One of the most pronounced new peacekeeping trends in recent years has been the inexorable growth in the demand for peacekeeping. Today, its scale and size are unprecedented. A record number of United Nations military, police and civilian personnel are serving on more missions than ever before — deploying to vast, remote and volatile environments where increasingly they confront non-State actors employing deadly unconventional tactics and where, as the Secretary-General has said, there is in fact no peace to keep and the risk of violence reoccurring is constant.

Yet public expectations are increasing about what peacekeeping can achieve. Scrutiny of peacekeeping effectiveness has never been more acute, the drive for efficiency never more pressing. So as we mobilize to confront those challenges, we must commit ourselves to adapting, innovating and continually improving. We must strengthen our capacity to deploy rapidly where the lives of civilians are at risk. Facing uncertainty, missions should be planned in a more flexible and iterative manner.

By prioritizing mandate elements and sequencing tasks using benchmarks, we can better meet mission objectives. Recent experiences in Mali and South Sudan show that we need to improve planning and mission support, whether generating fresh troops or through inter-mission cooperation. We must continue to strengthen ties with regional and subregional organizations whose member States are so often the first responders when conflict erupts. We welcome Rwanda's advice that we will have an opportunity to examine this in more detail next month.

We must embrace new technologies in support of peacekeeping. Unarmed, unmanned aerial systems providing intelligence day and night have been crucial in helping MONUSCO to neutralize armed groups preying on civilians in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Simple measures, such as installing perimeter lighting and cameras around United Nations bases, can free personnel from static security tasks so they may increase active patrolling, expanding further their protective footprint.

Those cost-effective enablers will not lessen the demand for boots on the ground or for other air assets in the sky. Rather, they allow those in the field to achieve their mandates in a safer, more effective and efficient manner. We encourage the Secretary-General to deploy those resources as he sees fit to meet the needs of each mission. We must all work collaboratively with the new United Nations Panel of Experts examining how other technologies can be leveraged to support peacekeeping. Of course, technologies only augment human capacity, so we must redouble our efforts to improve training to better prepare personnel to conduct mission tasks and to confront the risks they face.

Ultimately, peacekeeping will only ever be a band-aid measure without a stable peace. That is where the coordination of peacekeeping and other Council instruments is so crucial. The now routine partnering of peacekeeping with preventive and protective sanctions measures, such as arms embargoes, is a vital factor in mitigating conflict and preserving the space for post-conflict reconstruction. We must not lose sight of the importance of the civilian side of peacekeeping to help build national capacities to address local problems. Done effectively, security sector reform; disarmament,

demobilization and reintegration; and reforms of justice and rule-of-law institutions can be the glue that binds a nation in the post-conflict phase.

The doubling of a number of United Nations police authorized by the Council over the past decade reflects a growing recognition that strengthening the rule of law is the basis for lasting stability and security. United Nations police are performing ever-expanding roles, from combating sexual violence and transnational crime to engaging communities to prevent conflict. We believe that the role of police in peacekeeping is something the Council should examine in a more systematic way.

To conclude, we must all see today's debate as an opportunity to take stock, revisit our assumptions and question current practices in peacekeeping. Collectively, as the peacekeeping partnership, we must resolve to heed the lessons learned and we need to continually refine our approach. We owe this to the men and women who serve as United Nations peacekeepers and to the many people they protect in our name.

Mrs. Perceval (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, we congratulate you on the coming 40 years and on your effective and lucid diplomacy. Argentina would also particularly like to commend the Russian Federation because tomorrow, 12 June, is Russia Day. We very much hope that your delegation will enjoy an excellent day for the country's celebration.

In Argentina, the saying "Will the last one to leave please turn off the light" may perhaps be conveyed by the Secretariat to the Secretary-General. We very much appreciate his briefing and wish him a happy birthday on 13 June. May he have a pleasant trip inaugurating the World Cup in the sisterly Federative Republic of Brazil.

I would also request the Jordanian delegation to transmit to our dear colleague, Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein, that the opening ideas of his statement were, as usual, very good but that, when rituals are repeated, they frequently become myths. And myths, at a certain point, wind up more real than reality. Although we have myths about peacekeeping operations, I will address some of the realities mentioned by my colleague.

I would first like to acknowledge the stimulating concept note submitted by the Russian Presidency on new trends in peacekeeping operations (S/2014/384, annex), which runs along the same lines as what we have been discussing, both with respect to the various draft resolutions on peacekeeping operations and to the Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, as well as in the broader realm of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of the General Assembly (C-34).

With respect to the recent shift in the mandates of several African missions, in particular the creation of an intervention brigade within the framework of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), which was authorized in order to implement certain peacekeeping tasks, while the principles of peacekeeping are clearly defined and well known, my country is concerned, as are other Member States, that recent practice seems to contradict those principles.

To put it in more colloquial terms, we cannot use the United Nations to wage war through other means. Our responsibility is to maintain international peace and security. Let us recall the recent recognition of the growing need for peacekeeping missions to be endowed with effective mandates that enable them to act in operations involving increased risk and unconventional threats. Nonetheless, we understand that the peacekeeping system was not conceived to impose peace, nor is it prepared to do so. We therefore encourage this Organization and all its bodies to debate and clearly define what we mean by "robust mandates".

In that regard, while we view as positive the trend for the Organization to oversee the command, control and financing of missions that require, in exceptional cases, that peace be imposed, we believe that the characteristics of an appropriate and effective tool for such exceptional tasks should be derived from a broad, overdue debate involving all Member States on peacekeeping and the use of force by this Organization and should not be the result of a fait accompli.

We believe that we should not disregard the principles of the peacekeeping system that we have worked so hard to build and that we should not put at risk the safety of United Nations personnel deployed in our missions on the ground, to whom, as have others, I offer the homage and recognition of my country, Argentina.

In that regard, after listening to other statements, the point is that those of us from countries that contribute troops and police should not be afraid that our citizens from the military and police, whether male or female, might suffer harm. No. They have been trained as

effective and solid professionals to act in exceptional situations in which violence is very much part of the environment. So let us be clear. These are not physical education or kindergarten teachers. They are military and police professionals. But our Organization cannot deal with and increasing number of situations of risk and violence without taking care to be effective in designing its mandates, its rules of engagement and the security contexts in which the men and women of the countries that provide troops and police are being asked to exercise their profession as soldiers and police. In other words, let us not add further risks to the inherent risk. That, I believe, is the message that the countries that contribute troops and police have been saying all along.

With respect to unmanned drones and the use of new technologies in peacekeeping missions, we believe that these new technologies can bring important capabilities to peacekeeping operations, so long as they are evaluated, on a case by case basis, with a view to their use in observation under the control of the Organization with strict respect for the norms that guide us. In that context, I would like to reiterate the demand that was made in the framework of the C-34. We want and hope to receive further information from the Secretariat with regard to the use of such technologies, including lessons learned in the confidential treatment of the information obtained, as well as on improvements in the safety of deployed personnel, the understanding of the operational situation and the protection of civilians.

New technologies cannot be developed out of thin air. They cannot be allowed to proliferate without regulation. If in this Organization we managed to adopt a non-proliferation treaty as an international legal framework -- still not quite universal -- how could we not work out a regulatory agreement that obligates all States to agree on the ethical and legal bases that will enable the reliable, efficient use of new technologies?

We believe that inter-mission cooperation, to which the Presidency's brilliant concept note also refers, should not be a substitute for the appropriate implementation and planning of a peacekeeping mission. We should ensure that such cooperation does not affect the fulfilment of the sending mission's mandate, and that it should be appropriately integrated by the receiving mission. That includes the challenge of maintaining sufficient budgetary discipline, which is necessary in such cases, with particular regard for the principle that no loans between active missions are allowed, as well as the rule that stipulates that the costs of inter-mission cooperation should be borne by the receiving mission.

Such considerations lead us, in conclusion, to the issue of financing for peacekeeping missions. We have observed a negative tendency to broaden the complexity of mandates without providing them with the financial resources necessary for their appropriate implementation. We insist that the matter of financial allocations to peacekeeping missions constitutes a political issue and not a simple budgetary question, since it affects the effectiveness and the credibility of the whole Organization.

Argentina believes that the future of peacekeeping operations depends on their having clear and adequately financed mandates. For that to be the case, we need to continue to be able to count on the necessary consensus in the General Assembly, so that the efforts of the troop-contributing countries are met by an analogous commitment on the part of those countries with greater financial responsibilities. The successful implementation of the various tasks specified in the peacekeeping mandates shines a spotlight on the effectiveness of those expenditures, in particular if we compare the lean budget of around $8 thousand million available for all peacekeeping operations with the enormous cost of global military expenditures.

Finally, the growing tendency to include aspects of peacebuilding in the mandates of our peacekeeping missions has transformed our peacekeepers into early peace builders. We consider that to be one of the most significant developments in peacekeeping operations in recent years. It is in fact essential in order to prevent countries from falling back into conflict and to enable peacekeeping operations to function with a platform that allows for the protection of human rights, development, gender equality, and the consolidation of democracy and the rule of law.

I cannot conclude my remarks without making an observation about the fact that we put ever more responsibility on specific sectors within the mandates of peacekeeping operations. Argentina agrees that they should cover the areas of human rights, the humanitarian efforts, the equality of women and the protection of children. But what often happens when we are on the ground is that we come to see that we should look strategically at how to conduct operations. Instead of piling more responsibilities onto a particular area, we should think about how we can coordinate and articulate them so that they dovetail with the various

agencies in the United Nations system and with the capacities we have in regional, subregional and national organizations. Because what happens? Superimposition and disconnectedness do not help promote peace, and what helps even less is competition between entities and organizations — competition for resources and a feudalization of their agendas. We should all work together cooperatively, not with the logic of the market but with a culture of peacekeeping.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I would now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the Russian Federation.

Today, various regions of the world are undergoing large-scale and sometimes unpredictable transformations. The international community is obliged to respond to such processes, including by adapting United Nations peacekeeping, one of our principal tools for maintaining international peace and security. United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed in complex and dangerous conditions, and increasingly often in situations of domestic political crisis complicated by difficult humanitarian and socioeconomic circumstances. Challenges such as the spread of weapons, organized crime, terrorism and drug trafficking across borders have become more acute.

These factors are affecting not only individual aspects of United Nations peacekeeping but in a number of cases also its principles. This requires thorough discussion and understanding on the part of Member States and the Secretariat in order to formulate consistent and balanced approaches, overcome the fragmented nature of the political and legal foundations, develop appropriate doctrines and prepare timely regulatory documents based on analysis of the experience gained, analysis that should continue to be guided by the unshakeable positions of the Charter of the United Nations and the basic principles of United Nations peacekeeping. The most important factor is a genuine partnership in joint peacekeeping efforts between the members of the international community.

One growing trend is the so-called strengthening of peacekeeping mandates, including by authorizing their use of preventive force. Such mandates include that of the Force Intervention Brigade within the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali has similar tasks. This experience has raised a number of unresolved legal, technical, staff and logistical issues for the Organization with the potential for adverse effects on the missions' effectiveness, the image of the United Nations and, most importantly, the peacekeepers' security.

We are certain that these issues should be addressed in an intergovernmental format within the specialized United Nations entities and with the active involvement of the troop-contributing countries (TCCs). This is essential in order to ensure that when the Security Council establishes individual mandates it relies on approaches that are agreed on system-wide. At the same time, when considering emerging challenges in this context, however complex, it is impossible to avoid discussing whether robust United Nations peacekeeping is the only way to improve the effectiveness of the maintenance of international peace and security and whether stronger mandates can be a substitute for the painstaking search for political solutions. It is clear that peacebuilding's chief task is still, as it has always been, creating the conditions for political dialogue, eradicating the root causes of conflicts and crises and achieving national reconciliation — which means achieving lasting peace.

Robust mandates cannot become business as usual and should be carefully calibrated according to the specific situation. Expanding such practices, which essentially imply the peacekeepers' support for one side of the conflict, as well as the possible loss of their protected status under international humanitarian law, will inevitably increase the political costs to the image of the United Nations and the security risks not only for the Blue Helmets but for other civilian personnel on the ground. Humanitarian and country team staff could become targets as well. This raises the question of how the United Nations will handle such consequences.

We have recently encountered such new phenomena as the presence of several different peacekeeping forces in one country, which creates additional challenges. While not disputing the potential positive contributions of national and regional forces, we believe that in order to do what must be done, there must be appropriate coordination between them, ideally through a single peacekeeping mission under United Nations auspices.

An equally important aspect of modern peacekeeping is the use of advanced technical equipment, particularly experimental use unarmed, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). There is no question that United Nations peacekeeping must keep up with the times, and technology can help implement mandates and

improve security for Blue Helmets. On the other hand, it is not an end in itself, but simply a tool that by virtue of its novelty requires the establishment of a political and legal framework for its use, emphasizing its operational and financial performance by comparison with already proven equipment such as traditional aircraft and the UNOSAT satellite data processing system.

The multifunctional nature of UAVs naturally raises the question of the modalities for controlling the information received and of preserving its confidentiality. We consider it important to ensure transparency for such processes. In that regard, since the start of UAV use in the Democratic Republic of the Congo Russia has urged that the experience be carefully studied. It is no secret that there have been problems as well as positive indications in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We believe that those aspects and the lessons learned will be reflected in an annex to the Secretary-General's annual report on the implementation of the recommendations of the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. In that context, we welcome the Secretariat's establishment of an Expert Panel on the use of new technologies. We hope to see impartial and technically sound results from its work that take into account the views of Member States, including TCCs.

The relevance of inter-mission cooperation has been proven in situations in neighbouring peacekeeping operations have deteriorated due to a lack of troops and air assets. However, recent proposals by the Secretary-General, including for the creation of a rapid reaction force in Côte d'Ivoire, suggest an attempt to make such methods a regular practice. We are not convinced of the advisability of handing decision-making control over the cross-border activity of this contingent to the Secretariat even in a situation where, as we understand it, the troop-contributing country has consented. The Security Council should also be responsible for evaluating problems arising on the ground and justifying such redeployment.

Mandates encompassing multiple components have become a reality, and they include large-scale peacebuilding tasks. However, it has taken several years for all the aspects of this approach to emerge. In analysing the results of a number of missions, we will have to rethink the algorithm for establishing priorities and their relationship to assistance. We are convinced that the chief efforts of peacekeeping operations should be focused on halting violence and reducing the risk of its renewal to a minimum. From the beginning, peacekeeping operation mandates have included long-term social, humanitarian and human-rights tasks that are often not adapted to a particular country's context and are frequently unjustified. Moreover, specialized United Nations entities exist to accomplish such directives, and they should be used.

The General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations plays a central role in formulating common approaches to peacebuilding for Member States and corresponding directives for the Secretariat. Logistical, budget and staffing issues should be discussed in the Fifth Committee. We see clear added value in drawing upon the capability of the experts of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. Effective discussions within such bodies are important to ensure that the Council takes informed decisions in developing individual mandates for peacekeeping missions, taking the views of TCCs and the situation on the ground into account. We are convinced that cooperation between the General Assembly and the Security Council will strengthen the strategic partnership in peacekeeping of the United Nations, which has a key advantage as the sole universal and legitimate body.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate the texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I wish to inform all concerned that we will continue this open debate through the lunch hour, as we have a large number of speakers.

I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Mukerji (India): We take it as a sign of the awareness that all is not well in the world of United Nations peacekeeping when the Russian Federation, which is a permanent member of the Security Council and its current President, decides, in our view with good reason, to hold this open debate on new trends in United Nations peacekeeping operations. The debate could not have come at a more opportune time for reasons that we will enumerate today, especially when many of the 106 United Nations peacekeepers who lost their lives in 2013, including those from India, died amid uncertainties faced by United Nations

peacekeeping operations, including while using force to protect civilians.

At the outset, we express the hope that other permanent members of the Security Council will continue to organize such open debates on United Nations peacekeeping during their presidencies of the Council so that Member States that contribute troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations, such as India, can see a glimmer of hope for the eventual implementation of Article 44 of the Charter of the United Nations. As you are aware, Mr. President, Article 44 clearly calls on the Security Council to invite Member States not represented on the Council

> "to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces".

However, that hardly ever happens in practice. The Council's views and expectations of troop-contributing countries (TCCs) that have been expressed this morning would call for holding such meetings with TCCs in the Chamber under Article 44.

We thank the Russian Federation for the concept note circulated to assist our debate today (S/2014/384, annex). We will focus on a few points in the concept note on the basis of our experience as a major United Nations troop-contributing country, having sent more than 170,000 Indian troops to 43 of the 68 peacekeeping operations mandated so far.

First, the concept note underscores the impact on United Nations peacekeeping operations of the increase in the number of crises that are armed conflicts of a non-international character, also referred to as internal or intra-State conflicts. In our view, that is an important issue. By mandating United Nations peacekeeping operations to deal with such internal conflicts, the Council is effectively impinging on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in which the principles for peacekeeping operations are firmly rooted. As my colleague from China mentioned this morning, those principles include the consent of the parties to the operations, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defence.

Our apprehension is exacerbated by the emerging proclivity of the Council subsequently to mix the traditional original mandate of United Nations peacekeeping operations with a new interventionist mandate for a small portion of the troops in the same peacekeeping operation. We have already experienced that with regard to the mandate of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) under resolution 2098 (2013) of March 2013. The Council is well aware that India contributes more than 4,000 troops to MONUSCO.

In our view, such a mixing of mandates directly affects the operational effectiveness of the peacekeeping operation, exposing traditional peacekeepers to unnecessary threats from armed internal conflicts not instigated by the United Nations itself. Furthermore, by being asked to be party to an internal armed conflict, all United Nations peacekeepers, not only those of the interventionist peace enforcement brigade, become liable to be treated as enemy combatants under international law and, as such, effectively forgo both their impartiality and their immunity from prosecution. Most significant, by resorting to the use of United Nations peacekeepers to tackle what are essentially internal political conflicts, we feel that the Council is effectively endorsing a short-sighted and unsustainable approach to the maintenance of international peace and security. That approach will lead to unprovoked and unnecessary casualties among United Nations peacekeepers and will ultimately erode the credibility and effectiveness of the Council itself.

The second important point highlighted by the concept note is the presence of elevated risks to United Nations peacekeeping oerations from non-governmental armed groups. We completely agree with that point. Earlier this year, in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping we substantiated with facts and figures our views on such a threat, as faced by us in the peacekeeping operations of MONUSCO, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, where our troops are deployed. It is a matter of concern that the Security Council has failed to take any effective action to address such risks.

Thirdly, the concept note points to the increasing trend of United Nations peacekeeping operations having to operate alongside other foreign military forces in the same theatre but with separate mandates that may differ from those approved by the Security Council. We assume that that point relates to the so-called hybrid United Nations peacekeeping operations, which have emerged out of the attempt to synergize the provisions of Chapter VIII and Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

In that context, we would note that, before acting under the provisions of Article 53, paragraph 1, of the Charter to mandate peacekeeping operations, the Security Council is required by the Charter to satisfy itself that all attempts at the pacific settlement of disputes set out in Article 52 have been exhausted by the Member States belonging to regional arrangements or regional agencies.

A fourth point made in the concept note relates to the resource implications for the new mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations and the emergence of multidimensional mandates. That is a very important issue. On the one hand, the new mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations are ambitiously drafted, running to many pages, as good governance templates. On the other hand, the very same penholders that are drafting those new mandates cavil at having to pay more money for the peacekeepers tasked to implement such mandates. The irony is that some members of the Council appear to expect to continue to pay 1992 prices for the services of peacekeepers required to serve in more complex multilayered mandates in the year 2014. That is tantamount to turning economic theory, not to mention morality, on its head.

The concept note ends with the tantalizing suggestion that there could be an outcome document as a result of this open debate. We strongly support that idea so that the valuable contributions made by all Member States in the Council today will be known and acted upon. My delegation is ready to contribute in any manner deemed fit to the creation of such a document. With that objective in mind, we offer the following specific proposals for the Council to consider including in such an outcome document.

First, we call on the Council to reconsider the use of intervention mandates for United Nations peacekeeping operations until all Member States that are contributing troops have been given the opportunity, under Article 44 of the Charter, to participate in the Council's decisions on such operations in the Chamber.

Secondly, we call on the Council to ensure the mandatory inclusion in all mandates for United Nations peacekeeping operations of legally binding provisions for prosecuting, penalizing and neutralizing any non-governmental armed groups and armed militias causing or threatening to cause harm to those operations.

Thirdly, we call on the Council to conduct a transparent and rigorous assessment in an open debate of whether or not the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations favouring the pacific settlement of disputes have been fully and sincerely complied with by the regional arrangements or regional agencies before the Council acts under Article 53, paragraph 1, to mandate United Nations peacekeeping operations, using the powers under Article 42 of the Charter. In our view, that must be an essential prerequisite for the deployment of United Nations peacekeepers in the so-called hybrid peacekeeping operations.

Fourthly, we call on the Council to take the initiative to unanimously agree to increase the reimbursements to United Nations peacekeepers on the basis of the rates proposed in the survey commissioned under the mandate of the General Assembly. That will send a strong signal from the Council to the international community that it is fully prepared to pay for the new mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations that it has approved.

Fifthly, we call on the Council to engage with troop-contributing countries under Article 44 of the Charter when drafting new multidimensional mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations. We believe that we can play a role in assisting the Council, under the provisions of Article 44, in determining the kind and number of troops required for the proposed mandate, the nature of equipment required and the costs of operating in the specific terrain of the theatre of operations.

Finally, we call on the Council to consider the role of other United Nations entities, such as the Peacebuilding Commission, the United Nations Development Fund, UN-Women, the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization, which can play an implementing role in the civilian components of the multidimensional mandates being approved for United Nations peacekeeping operations. On that basis, different components of those mandates should be clearly earmarked to the appropriate United Nations entity.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Yoshikawa (Japan): Mr. President, I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation for the initiative and leadership you have shown in convening today's open debate on the important issue of United Nations peacekeeping operations. I will be very brief.

From their inception, United Nations peacekeeping operations have been evolving. Contemporary peacekeeping has become multidimensional, with broader roles and responsibilities. Fifteen years after the Brahimi report (S/2000/809), resolution 2086 (2013) renewed our consideration of trends in peacekeeping. Recent peacekeeping also has delivered several innovations including the Force Intervention Brigade, unmanned unarmed aerial vehicles and inter-mission cooperation, inter alia. The most important fact is that peacekeeping continues to be a flagship initiative of the United Nations for international peace and security. We should maintain and improve that important tool. In that regard, a key question is how to make United Nations peacekeeping operations sustainable in both financial and human resources terms.

Let me first touch upon the financial challenge. The United Nations peacekeeping budget for 2014-2015 will probably greatly exceed its historical high of $8 billion. While we fully recognize the important role of peacekeeping operations in the maintenance of international peace and security, the fiscal environment of Member States, including Japan, does not allow unlimited resources for peacekeeping. Very strong efficiency measures are called for.

Right-sizing is a promising approach to meeting such financial challenges. When an idea to establish a new mission emerges, full consideration should be given to whether it is cost-effective or not. The mission's mandate has to be elaborated based on the reality on the ground and should be responsive to the changing situation in the field. To that end, the Secretary-General should keep a close eye on developments on the ground and make timely and realistic recommendations to the Security Council. The Security Council should review the mandate of each mission in a timely manner and ensure the effectiveness of the mission's activities. Automatic renewal of mission mandates should be avoided and mandates of prolonged missions should be thoroughly reviewed.

Let me move on to the challenge posed by limited human resources. It is clear that a large number of qualified peacekeepers is essential for peacekeeping activities. However, we very often struggle to find all the personnel we need. Due to today's surge in the demand for peacekeeping missions, human resources are overstretched. It is a pressing task to increase the number of qualified peacekeepers and create a strong pool of them. In that regard, I would like to highlight two points.

First, broadening troop contributors is a way to cope with the challenge. It is true that current peacekeeping missions depend on a limited number of troop-contributing countries. In order to overcome such limitations, we should continue to assist prospective troop-contributing countries.

Secondly, we need more training, which is a very effective way to create qualified peacekeepers. Upholding standards of discipline for peacekeepers, including preventing sexual exploitation and abuse, is essential to ensuring a mission's credibility. In addition, peacekeepers are now required to be competent in complex tasks. Therefore, we should provide full-spectrum training to create qualified peacekeepers.

Japan has participated in peacekeeping operations for more than 20 years. We have dispatched more than 10,000 personnel to 12 peacekeeping operation missions. I will skip the details now because of time limitations; they can be found in the written text that I will circulate in the Chamber. However, let me emphasize that Japan wishes to contribute to peacekeeping operations by broadening its involvement under the banner of "Proactive Contribution to Peace".

In closing, I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to all peacekeepers. I also express our deepest condolences to the survivors of those peacekeepers who made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (European Union) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to congratulate you personally, Mr. President, as well as the Russian Federation, on assuming the presidency of the Security Council this month.

(*spoke in English*)

I would also like to thank our Korean friends and colleagues for their presidency last month.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; as

well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

In the interests of time, I will give a shortened version of the written text that was prepared for today's meeting; the full version of that text will be circulated in the Chamber.

Let me begin by saying that we are grateful for the work done by the Secretariat to innovate and strengthen the capabilities of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping remains the flagship activity of the United Nations and a crucial tool paving the way for longer-term stability and development of countries emerging from a crisis. The important work of all actors in partnership with the United Nations is a tremendous effort that may not always be given due recognition. A few days ago, on 29 May, we celebrated International Day of United Nations Peacekeepers. We would like to once again pay tribute to and express our deep appreciation and respect for those who have lost their lives in the service of the United Nations.

We share the view that the peacekeeping agenda requires regular exchanges among all stakeholders, from troop- and police-contributing countries, the Secretariat, the Security Council, to the broader membership of the General Assembly. In that regard, we underline the relevance of resolution 1353 (2001). Important discussions have also taken place earlier in the year in the context of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

The direct involvement of peacekeepers is required in increasingly volatile situations, and they are facing higher risks than ever before. Ensuring that peacekeepers are well trained and equipped with the most up to date tools is of essence if mandates are to be delivered with due regard to the safety and security of men and women on the ground. We should ensure that troops benefit from the certified training they need before their deployment to the field.

A more robust mandate and the use of new capabilities, such as the Force Intervention Brigade in United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), have demonstrated that peace enforcement where necessary and under defined conditions can support the success and legitimacy of a United Nations operation. At the same time, we also need to focus on using existing capabilities in the most effective way possible and on making sure that those capabilities can perform in an optimal way.

The European Union and its member States support those modernization efforts. Specifically, we commend the Secretariat's efforts towards the wider use of modern technologies in peacekeeping operations. We have learned that the use of such technology in MONUSCO has already supported a better delivery of its protection mandate and increased the situational awareness of troops on the ground. We encourage the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to further explore opportunities to use modern technology in peacekeeping missions.

Secondly, we strongly believe in the central importance of the protection of all civilians, particularly women and children, in armed conflict. That is often decisive for the success and legitimacy of a United Nations peacekeeping operation.

We also encourage ongoing efforts to fully implement the resolutions on women and peace and security, including in engaging women in conflict prevention, peacemaking and peacebuilding processes, and its resolutions on children and armed conflict. Integrating a gender and child protection perspective in the training of military, police and civilian staff in peacekeeping operations is equally important. We welcome the United Nations resolve in preventing and combating sexual exploitation and abuse and emphasize the key role senior mission leadership plays in ensuring accountability.

The presidential statement (S/PRST/2014/3) adopted on the occasion of the debate on the protection of civilians (see S/PV.7109) earlier in the year gives further guidance for the consideration of issues pertaining to the protection of civilians in armed conflict. Nonetheless, more needs to be done in order to translate the normative process into concrete improvements on the ground.

Peacekeeping missions play an important role in peacebuilding and the continued work on the peacekeeping/peacebuilding nexus remains important. We recognize the close links between peace, security, development and gender equality. In that context, we welcome the work on the United Nations policy on transitions, which demonstrates the close links between those different activities, with the aim of producing a positive outcome to post-crisis situations.

We appreciate the increased attention given to the role of regional organizations in peacekeeping. In that context, the European Union obviously also welcomed the adoption by the Council of the first-ever presidential statement in which it encouraged both organizations — the United Nations and the European Union — to further strengthen their institutional relations and strategic partnership (S/PRST/2014/4). High Representative Ashton has briefed the Council on numerous occasions, and Under-Secretary-General Ladsous regularly attends informal EU Defence Ministers' meetings.

On the ground, there are also many concrete examples that show the close partnership the European Union has with the United Nations. For instance, the European Union military mission to contribute to the training of the Malian Armed Forces is working alongside the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali to deliver on our shared aims. The European Union has also developed a strong partnership with the African Union in Somalia, through the African Union Mission in Somalia. The European Union has played and continues to play an important role in the cases of Mali and the Central African Republic by financially supporting African-led missions that precede and pave the way for United Nations peacekeeping operations. Last but not least, the European Union and its member States deploy many efforts to support African countries in developing their own military capabilities with a view to helping them contribute to the United Nations peace and security agenda.

The EU and its member States make an important contribution to the guidance of United Nations peacekeeping and have a great interest in making United Nations peacekeeping more efficient. We therefore look forward to constructive exchanges with all partners on issues raised in all the appropriate forums.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Sweden.

Mr. Grunditz (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and my own country, Sweden. We thank the Secretary-General for his important statement and welcome this opportunity to discuss new trends and challenges to peacekeeping. Forward-leaning action at the political, strategic and operational levels will be needed to make modern United Nations peacekeeping fit for purpose. Peacekeeping activities should be designed not only to keep the peace, but also to facilitate post-conflict peacebuilding, help prevent relapses into conflict and assist in progress towards sustainable peace and development.

At the outset, allow me to pay tribute to all troop- and police-contributing countries that, through their commitment to international peace and security, readily put their personnel in harm's way, often in hostile environments in countries suffering from conflict. In so doing, they form the backbone of United Nations peacekeeping, and we should all be grateful for their commitment and sacrifice.

I would like to acknowledge the important progress made by African States within the framework of the African Peace and Security Architecture. The Nordic countries stand ready to continue to support a further enhanced African ability to deal with peace and security challenges on African soil.

The Nordic countries have a long-standing tradition of participating and cooperating in United Nations peacekeeping. That engagement continues and is being strengthened. Several Nordic countries are participating in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA). Sweden will soon make a substantial contribution consisting of an intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance unit, which will support the All Sources Information Fusion Unit of MINUSMA.

The conditions facing peacekeeping today pose new challenges to the security of peacekeepers and the protection of civilians, which is one of the key tasks of United Nations peacekeeping missions. We believe that new technology, in addition to providing enhanced force protection, will strengthen the ability to protect civilians. It also has the potential of improving the operational effect — and thus efficiency — of missions in carrying out their mandates. We look forward to contributing to the development of a conceptual approach for the use of information and analysis units and unarmed unmanned aerial vehicles within United Nations missions.

New operational methods and technologies also require new working methods. At the operational level, it is essential that appropriate systems be developed for a relevant level of information security and the use of secure communications. At the strategic level, the increased use of new technologies needs to be reflected in United Nations policy and regulatory documents.

That is vital, not only for the sake of efficiency, but also for the legitimacy of United Nations peacekeeping.

The further development of the use of inter-mission cooperation, including through the use of military reserve forces, could be another way to enhance the efficiency of peacekeeping operations. Mobile reaction forces within missions or in regional arrangements involving more than one mission would offer a higher degree of flexibility and sustainability for missions than we see today.

A more complex reality for United Nations peacekeeping also requires more efforts to provide appropriate training to police and military personnel operating in United Nations missions. Priority should be given to developing standards within the rule of law context, with an emphasis on the role of the police in peacekeeping. Furthermore, the capacity of peacekeepers to create an enabling environment for peacebuilding activities in critical areas such as security sector reform, rule of law and human rights should be strengthened. In the context of training, we continue to emphasize the importance of ensuring that the provisions of resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security are reflected in all activities relating to peacekeeping.

The Nordic countries also welcome the ongoing trend of the systematic integration of human rights components into peacekeeping operations. It is our long-standing position that respect for human rights is a central aspect of all peace operations. Preventing impunity is a key element in creating sustainable peace. While prevention is crucial in trying to avoid conflict, lasting peace requires a sustainable presence by the international community throughout the whole conflict cycle. It is necessary to support peacebuilding in order to prevent relapses into conflict. The transition of responsibility from full-fledged peacekeeping operations to political missions, United Nations country teams, host country authorities and national actors requires careful stewardship.

The cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations and actors needs to be strengthened to reinforce such efforts. We acknowledge resolution 2086 (2013) on multidimensional peacekeeping, which highlights the importance of coherence between peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development. The 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which should be comprehensive in scope, may help us improve our ability to provide coordinated support — a United Nations delivering as one — to countries emerging from conflict by linking security with development more closely and ensuring seamless transitions between missions and United Nations country teams.

Finally, United Nations peacekeeping missions also need to minimize the environmental impact of their presence, in order to not adversely affect local communities and their livelihoods. We need to "green the Blue". The Nordic countries stand ready to engage in a discussion on how to best address that issue in a broader peacekeeping context.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): We thank you, Ambassador Churkin, for convening this important debate and for consulting with the troop-contributing countries during its preparation. Thanks also for giving us a substantive concept note (S/2014/384, annex) and for your leadership on peacekeeping.

Peacekeeping is the mainstay of the United Nations in its continuing effort to maintain international peace and security. Contemporary conflicts have become much more complex, chronic and lethal. It is our collective responsibility to forge common ground as peacekeeping policy and practice evolve. That requires a genuine partnership between the Security Council, the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. Resolution 2086 (2013) of January 2013 took important decisions to consolidate the work on multidimensional peacekeeping.

Pakistan is one of the top troop-contributing countries, having contributed over 150,000 personnel to 41 United Nations peacekeeping operations, including traditional and complex missions, since 1960. Our men and women have served with distinction and professionalism in some of the most difficult and demanding environments. We have been associated with peacekeeping throughout its journey of evolution. It is with that experience and record that we contribute to this debate.

The concept of a robust mandate has been invoked and applied in the recent past to deal with what looked like an usually complex conflict situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The decision to do so was taken with two caveats — it should not constitute a precedent and it should be without prejudice

to the basic principles of peacekeeping. We believe that robust peacekeeping and peace enforcement should not be conflated conceptually or operationally. The United Nations peacekeeping missions have used robust peacekeeping successfully in the past whenever the need arose. In that sense, it is not a new trend. Authorizations for such operations have conformed to the basic principles of peacekeeping: impartiality, the consent of the parties and the non-use of force except in self-defence or in defence of the authorized mandates. That must continue.

The United Nations keeps the peace. It does not seek military solutions. That is why measures agreed on an exceptional basis should not be replicated. United Nations peacekeeping missions should not be caught up in asymmetric warfare, become combatants, be seen as partisan, become an arm of the national defence forces or take actions that would be subject to condemnation under international humanitarian law.

The use of new technology is a new trend. Missions are using sensors, radars, global positioning systems, night-vision devices and high-tech avionics to enhance their operational effectiveness. Recently, an unarmed unmanned aerial system was introduced in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo on a trial basis to provide early warning and improve situational awareness, which will assist the Mission in protecting and increasing the safety and security of peacekeepers. That technology is now becoming a growth industry. We believe that its deployment should not be industry-driven, but demand-driven. In deploying that technology, we need to be selective and fully sensitive to the concerns of the host country and neighbouring States. The use of technology should be tailored to specific environments and structures and be consistent with the basic peacekeeping principles.

Inter-mission cooperation is an interim stopgap arrangement in the regional context. Sudden and large movements of troops from one theatre to another are neither feasible nor desirable. The consent of the host Government and the troop-contributing countries is important in that context. There is also a need to devise standard operating procedures, including built-in provisions for the optimal utilization of the International Medical Corps. It is now time to discard the current thinking about reserves. We should go for uncommitted, dedicated reserves in the mission area. That will be a critical investment.

We should also continue to strengthen regional cooperation, which brings complementarity to United Nations peacekeeping efforts and enhances regional ownership. We need a more holistic approach to peacekeeping that integrates the political and security aspects with national reconciliation, transitional criminal justice, capacity-building and economic and development enablers, which are critical for peacebuilding and the prevention of relapse. Where required, such multi-pronged efforts will need to assume a broader regional dimension, such as in the United Nations integrated strategy for the Sahel and the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Region.

For effective implementation, mandates need to be matched with adequate resources. Priority should be given to the core function of peacekeeping, which is the provision of a safe and secure environment. That is why sufficient military and police capacities, meeting United Nations standards, remain so crucial in mission configurations and must not be compromised solely for the purposes of cost-cutting.

Effective implementation of complex mandates also entails close coordination and engagement with troop- and police-contributing countries. Decisions on the design and modification of mandates, as well as on the renewal, transition and drawdown of missions, must be made with prior and substantive consultations with the troop-contributing countries.

While tackling new trends, we must also earnestly address one of the long outstanding issues confronting peacekeeping — the revision of troop costs. Considerable investment has gone into that exercise, including recently by the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and related issues, which has now recommended an empirically established figure for cost reimbursement. The stage is set to take the next logical step for the upward revision of troop costs and a permanent mechanism for its periodic review. An ad hoc, interim or phased increase would not address the problem. It is a question of political will, which we hope Member States will be able to muster in the interest of peace and peacekeeping.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Italy.

Mr. Cardi (Italy): Let me first thank you, Sir, and your delegation for convening this crucial meeting

today to discuss one of the key challenges that this Organization is now facing. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his remarks at the beginning of the meeting.

Italy aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union, but I would like to add a few remarks in my national capacity.

The maintenance of international peace and security is the core business of the United Nations. Peace is the first and most valuable objective that an organization of States should pursue. Nevertheless, the world has changed since the end of the Second World War. First, the contexts within which our peacekeeping operations are conducted have radically changed. As underlined in the concept note (S/2014/384, annex) submitted by the Council presidency, and I quote, "the vast majority of crises in which United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed or their mandates extended are non-international armed conflicts, often referred to as internal or intra-State conflicts". Secondly, United Nations peacekeeping efforts have now reached numbers, in terms of troops as well as financial resources engaged, that cannot be compared to what they were, let's say, only 10 years ago. And thirdly, but no less importantly, conflicts today are no longer just a matter of sending troops to the front line, but they call for cutting-edge military and civilian capacities, such as technology and skilled soldiers.

Italy is the first troop contributor in the Western European and other States Group and the seventh financial contributor to the United Nations peacekeeping operations. An Italian general is leading the operation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. Through that engagement in the field, we, together with the rest of the membership, learn lessons every day that help us make our commitment to the service of peace more effective. Troops cannot operate without proper equipment and skills in conflict situations where most of the parties involved have at least the basic technological tools. As the Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, Ms. Haq, said at the opening meeting of the recent session of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations,

> "providing for the safety and security of deployed personnel in volatile environments is an absolute necessity... Applying new technologies needs to become a more standard feature of our modus operandi".

That was in reference to the security of the United Nations Blue Helmets. Nevertheless, we also noticed with satisfaction that, this year, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations agreed to mention such technological tools in its report in the context of military capacity, encouraging

> "the Secretariat to support the agreed use of modern technology consistent with the basic principles of peacekeeping, to enhance, among others, situational awareness and force protection" (*A/68/19, para. 80*).

Italy agrees with the Special Committee and is pleased that the main policy body on United Nations peacekeeping tackled that issue successfully. My delegation chose to engage proactively in co-facilitating the negotiation process that led to that result.

Most of today's peacekeeping operations have a mandate to protect civilians. That is an important development. As an example, since the eruption of the South Sudan conflict at the end of last year, over 70,000 people have been rescued and hosted in peacekeeping camps. That demonstrates humanitarian aid in action, for which peacekeeping gains credibility and praise. It is only normal that vulnerable civilians suffering hardship would look to the Blue Helmets for protection and refuge.

Owing to the reality of today's conflicts, the disparity between the expectations imposed on the United Nations and its capacity to respond has grown starker. In these times of budgetary hardship and constraints, the only possible solution is to reduce that disparity through innovation. As Under-Secretary-General Ladsous said in his statement to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations at the opening meeting of this year's session, "flexibility and innovation at Headquarters and within our missions are no longer an option, but an acute necessity".

The United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, for example, also provides a relevant case study for the topic. The need to provide for civilian protection has brought about the creation of new tools, such as the unarmed, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and the Force Intervention Brigade. Both have delivered so far and met the highest expectations, make their contribution not only in the direct framework of the peacekeeping operation, but also by saving civilian lives, as was the case recently when a UAV spotted a

sinking boat in a river, leading to a rescue operation that saved human lives.

Italy understands and shares some of the concerns of Member States — especially those from the continent that sees the highest number of operations, Africa — about the new trends in United Nations peacekeeping, as highlighted in this meeting's concept paper. It is not by chance that Italy actively participates in and promotes discussions and negotiations on this sensitive matter in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and other venues. In the recent panel we organized outside the United Nations, information was presented on how missions could benefit from satellite imaging to locate water, to dig wells, as well as to determine appropriate sites for solar and other renewable energy systems. We also learned how information communications technology is crucial to providing mission staff with up-to-the-minute data; how biometric handheld devices can be used to gather basic health and identifying information of refugees; and how water generators can pull moisture from the air to provide up to 4,000 litres of drinking water a day. Here, I would also like to mention the project funded by Italy and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research that uses satellite images to verify compliance with resolution 2139 (2014) concerning humanitarian access in Syria.

In closing, we should never forget that, at the end of the day, peacekeeping is a moral imperative. It is a duty that rests on the shoulders of all Member States. All of the aforementioned concerns — from the use of data collected by recognition devices to the effects of inter-mission cooperation, the level of budgetary discipline, issues that must be discussed with troop-contributing countries and the training of peacekeepers, which must be enhanced — are more than legitimate. Nevertheless, we feel that, if the new trends in peacekeeping can help, as they have shown that they can, to do a better job in the service of peace, we should continue to explore state-of-the-art solutions to meet those concerns. United Nations peacekeeping has entered the twenty-first century. Let us work together with that objective in mind.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin by congratulating the Russian Federation on organizing this open debate and by thanking you, Mr. President, for the concept note prepared on this important topic (S/2014/384, annex). We also thank the Secretary-General for his observations. As a former member of the Council and a troop-contributing country, we consider it essential to hold a discussion on the recent trends in peacekeeping operations under the United Nations flag.

My delegation offers the following observations. First, in general we support complex multidimensional mandates, including those contemplating a wide range of tasks designed to stabilize countries in conflict. However, the increase in the number of tasks that lack clear prioritization could potentially fragment or overburden the work of troops on the ground, thereby limiting and even diverting their attention from the main goal of their presence. Therefore, we have insisted that all peacekeeping operations have clear, achievable and verifiable mandates adapted to each specific situation.

Secondly, we remain seriously apprehensive about the implications and scope of the so-called robust peacekeeping operations, as noted in our explanation of vote when the Council considered resolution 2098 (2013) on the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in March 2013 (see S/PV.6943). The deployment of peace-enforcement forces raises various questions, in particular, how to reconcile their functions with the basic principles of peacekeeping.

Thirdly, although we recognize the added value of the use of modern technologies, such as unmanned aerial vehicles, as part of the efforts to protect civilians in peacekeeping operations, we also recognize the risks involved, especially in the application of the basic norms of international humanitarian law in the context of maintaining the distinction between combatants and non-combatants, and the distinction between using those technologies for the maintenance of peace in contrast to peace enforcement. It is therefore essential that the use of modern technologies adhere to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Fourthly, regarding inter-mission cooperation, while we recognize its relevance, we also believe that it is necessary to consider issues of timing, the requirements that must be met, the impact on the missions affected and their effective implementation. In that context, we believe that the Council should be careful, when using that tool, to respect the mandates of each of the missions, as well as the memorandums of

understanding that troop-contributing countries signed previously with the United Nations in relation to each operation.

Finally, my delegation considers it necessary to carry out a cost-benefit analysis of the implementation of each one of those issues. The analysis should devote particular attention to the lessons learned, as well as to the legal, operational and financial policy implications imposed on troop-contributing countries.

In conclusion, I reiterate the central role of United Nations peacekeeping operations for the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as the importance that we attach to strengthening their operational capacity and organizational structure. We stress the importance of maintaining the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations as the only forum for discussing the Secretariat's policies on matters relating to peacekeeping operations. We call for improved coordination and consultation among the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries in the decision-making process, and we affirm that we will continue to provide personnel meeting the highest standards of efficiency, competence, discipline and integrity for peacekeeping operations.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would like to draw attention to the fact that no one has come close to speaking under the time limit that we have asked speakers, other than members of the Security Council, to respect. I request speakers to do their best to limit the length of the text being read out in our meeting today.

I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mr. Sinhaseni (Thailand): Mr. President, let me begin by expressing my delegation's sincere appreciation to the Russian delegation for its presidency of the Council this month and to you, Ambassador Churkin, for organizing this open debate and the well-drafted concept note (S/2014/384, annex). I also thank the Secretary-General for his substantive briefing on the issue.

Thailand has always attached great importance to United Nations peacekeeping as one of the most effective tools in assisting conflict-ridden countries to return to the path of peace and security. We have participated in over 20 United Nations peacekeeping operations. United Nations peacekeeping operations have evolved over the years. It is therefore most timely and appropriate that the Council take stock of the emerging trends, assess their implications and prepare itself to meet the challenges ahead. As we learned from the Secretary-General's briefing and from the concept note, a number of discernible trends in modern-day peacekeeping operations can be identified. My delegation wishes to highlight two points.

First, the success of United Nations peacekeeping operations is anchored in the basic principles of United Nations peacekeeping, namely, the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defence and in defence of the mandate. However, recent developments towards more robust and proactive peacekeeping may not be strictly consistent with such principles.

The majority of current United Nations peacekeeping missions operate in a situation of protracted intra-State conflict. In that context, what does "consent of the parties to the conflict" entail? There is the consent of the host country. However, it is not the practice of the United Nations to seek the consent of non-State actors, since engagement with non-State actors has political implications and must proceed with caution. That means, therefore, that peacekeepers are often deployed in politically sensitive environments or in the absence of a commitment to a political solution on the part of all of the key parties to the conflict.

Regarding the principle of impartiality, a case in point is resolution 2098 (2013), which created the Force Intervention Brigade and authorized it to neutralize armed groups in support of the authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. That raises the question of impartiality. Do United Nations peacekeepers become a party to the conflict on the side of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo? An affirmative answer to that question has serious legal implications for the protected status of the peacekeepers as well as for their safety and security.

Let me now turn to the protection-of-civilians mandate in relation to the principle of the non-use of force. While there is no argument regarding the need to safeguard civilian lives, to do so effectively may require peacekeepers to use force against those who pose threats to civilians. It is indeed legitimate to use force in defence of the mission's mandate. However, when a mandate clearly necessitates the use of force, such as the authorization given to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission

in Mali to use "all necessary means" to deter threats and to take active steps to prevent the return of armed elements to key population centres, that creates a strain on the principle of the non-use of force.

Secondly, it is not possible to achieve durable peace if women are not included or are left on the margins. We observe that, since the adoption of resolution 1325 (2000), there have been greater efforts to mainstream a gender perspective and increase women's contribution to United Nations peacekeeping. Women, peace and security is now a mandate component of 12 United Nations peacekeeping operations, including the newly created United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic. Thailand warmly welcomes the recent appointment by the Secretary-General of the first female peacekeeping force commander, Major General Kristin Lund of Norway, as the Force Commander of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus.

Despite the progress made, the proportion of female peacekeepers remains very low. Women represent approximately 10 per cent of the United Nations police personnel and less than 3 per cent of the total United Nations military personnel. We therefore still have a long way to go before the full potential of women's contribution to peace and security is realized. We are of the view that the gender-mainstreaming effort must continue to be prioritized in United Nations peacekeeping. It may be necessary to revisit the issue, in particular by working on how to translate the vision of women, peace and security into reality on the ground.

United Nations peacekeeping is now a collective enterprise with multidimensional aspects, each of which merits careful consideration. I have touched upon two emerging trends and their implications. To meet the challenges ahead, we wish to reiterate that important policy discussions and decisions pertaining to United Nations peacekeeping should be conducted and taken in a consensual manner. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations — whose members includes troop-contributing countries, police-contributing countries, host countries, Council members and other interested countries — is the appropriate forum for such an exercise. In addition, effective and regular consultations among the Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries should be held regularly, and such discussions should form the basis for decisions authorizing United Nations peacekeeping missions and their mandates.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Belarus.

Mr. Ambrazevich (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on Russia's accession to the presidency of the Security Council this month and on tomorrow's national holiday in the Russian Federation.

This is an appropriate time to hold an open debate in the Security Council on such an urgent concern as United Nations peacekeeping operations. Allow me to express our conviction that all nations should take the lead in reducing the need for such operations. Since it was founded, the international community has worked to improve the shape and operating methods of the United Nations, so that the Organization can be in a position to best respond in a timely manner to the challenges and threats facing humankind.

Within the whole range of United Nations activities, we note the particular importance of United Nations peacekeeping operations. United Nations peacekeeping operations today remain one of the key stabilizing factors in areas of tension, and it is clear that the nature of conflicts today has changed significantly. On many occasions, non-State armed groups and terrorist organizations have used cutting-edge technology to achieve their criminal goals, and conflicts have been assuming a cross-border nature.

New challenges and threats require the United Nations to be flexible and respond appropriately, including in accordance with the appropriate mandates for conducting operations and in terms of training and equipping peacekeepers with up-to-date materiel, resources, weaponry and technology. In that regard, we note the work being undertaken within the United Nations to adapt the format of peacekeeping operations to new realities, including through further cooperation with regional organizations and the use of specialized divisions and new technology. We are convinced, however, that United Nations peacekeeping operations must be conducted with strict respect for their mandates. Above all, that requires respect for such principles as sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of the host State.

Belarus has pursued a consistently responsible policy with respect to the maintenance of peace and security. A clear instance of that arose in 1993, when Belarus became the first country of the former Soviet Union to relinquish position of nuclear weapons.

In recognition of the importance of participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations, Belarus is contributing thereto to the best of its ability. It has deployed representatives in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

The issue of sending its troops overseas is of great sensitivity to Belarus. We lost approximately one-third of our population in the Second World War, and incurred further significant losses in the Soviet operation in Afghanistan. Drawing lessons from history, the potential broadening of Belarusian participation in United Nations peacekeeping will therefore require the full support and understanding of public opinion in our country. We are carefully studying at the State level the possible expansion of our participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mr. Abdrakhmanov (Kazakhstan) (*spoke in Russian*): I thank you, Sir, for convening this important meeting to assess the conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations. We believe that it is most timely to consider this cornerstone of the maintenance of international peace and security in the context of constantly evolving and changing trends.

(*spoke in English*)

Peacekeeping operations are now compelled to be much more multidimensional and multifunctional, with an unprecedented number of tasks, which means that mandates must be strong, clearly stated and agreed upon by all participants, with phased, sequential benchmarks for operations to become achievable. Peacekeeping operations today are also multinational and multicultural, with personnel from over 100 countries.

Thus, with the new trends, the coordination, streamlining and high standards of training for hybrid peacekeeping operations have become key factors of success, which will have to be reviewed by the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the United Nations system as a whole, Member States and all other partners. Likewise, field personnel will require greater skill in liaising and cooperating with host nations and internal and external parties, including regional organiszations and non-governmental organizations, which are often the first responders. High priority should also be accorded to gender, humanitarian law and strict codes of conduct.

Peacekeepers today are deployed in most hostile situations where there is no peace to keep, in the classical sense. War zones always face a higher incidence of accidents and illness, but the number of malicious acts in these hybrid peacekeeping operations lead to a higher increase in fatalities. Thus, a systematized plan of greater security to reduce the higher risks is crucial.

The deployment of new technologies, such as unmanned aerial vehicles — used solely for surveillance purposes, situational awareness and saving the lives of United Nations personnel and local populations alike — have shown beneficial results. At the same time, it would be helpful to have a special task force and platform in the Security Council to discuss future potential advances and modernization, deployment and the ethical dilemmas involved.

Peacekeepers come in many guises and with varying areas of expertise, from military personnel to economists, legal experts, electoral observers, human rights monitors, and specialists in civil affairs, governance and communications, to mention but a few. Once again, thorough training and the development of on-call lists of qualified personnel to fill numerous positions rapidly in operations worldwide will, we hope, meet that challenge.

The annual costs of United Nations peacekeeping today exceed all other areas of United Nations activity combined, which necessitates improved logistics and administrative practices, the strengthening of human capacity and infrastructure to make peacekeeping operations cost-effective, and valuable investment in saving lives. Member States are therefore urged to contribute more, with all actors helping one another by building partnerships.

My country, Kazakhstan, stands ready to help United Nations peacekeeping operations to be effective and efficient in fulfilling their tasks. We commend the selfless service of all peacekeepers and honour those who have lost their lives for the cause of peace.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Spain.

Mr. De Benito (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like first to thank the Secretary-General for his briefing this morning on the current situation and new trends in peacekeeping operations. We also thank the Russian presidency for its initiative in convening this debate and for the priority it has

attached to this issue in the Council's programme of work.

Spain fully aligns itself with the statement made by the observer of the European Union and wishes to offer the following contribution in its national capacity.

Spain believes that peacekeeping operations are a key component of the comprehensive strategy in favour of international security, which has shown itself capable of responding effectively and flexibly to the challenges posed by the new typology of conflicts in difficult and changing environments. We value the multidimensional nature of peacekeeping operations as a formula to establish sustainable peace, equipped with clear and feasible mandates and adequate resources allowing us to respond to security challenges and to the needs of host countries and of the civilian population.

We highlight the role of regional and subregional organizations in peacekeeping. We firmly support all efforts aimed at continuing to strengthen this collaboration in the conviction that it provides effectiveness and coherence to the actions undertaken, thereby avoiding duplication and taking advantage of the complementary nature of their respective efforts. At times, collaboration with regional organizations is also crucial for strengthening the invaluable regional ownership of the solution of conflicts.

We value very positively the high level of cooperation between the United Nations and the European Union, both with regards to institutional dialogue and at the operational level. Cooperation on the ground in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, along the border between Chad and the Central African Republic, and more recently in Mali and the Central African Republic provides a model to follow and to deepen in the coming years.

International peace and security is not an abstract concept; as reality reminds us every day, conflict affects millions of men and women directly and with immediacy, and it is to them we owe our efforts. We therefore welcome the Security Council's interest in the fundamental issue of the protection of civilians, as expressed in its debate in February (see S/PV.7109). The inclusion of protection of civilians in peacekeeping operations mandates is a fundamental step. In that regard, we consider it vital that child protection also be incorporated from the beginning into all United Nations activities relating to the defence of international peace and security through the inclusion of the issue in mandates. I would like to reiterate once again Spain's full support for the Secretary-General's Children, Not Soldiers campaign.

We firmly support the efforts to implement fully the resolutions relating to women and peace and security. Spain commends the British initiative to hold the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict and is fully confident that an international protocol for investigating and documenting sexual violence in conflict will be a valuable instrument for the appropriate protection of victims and response from our contingents.

This year, Spain is celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its participation in peacekeeping operations. My country has contributed to more than 50 missions and crisis management operations and has deployed more than 137,000 troops in such complex theatres as Lebanon, Afghanistan, the coast of Somalia, Mali and the Central African Republic, exemplifying Spain's commitment to the primacy of international law and to a more stable world.

I would like to express our sincere appreciation to the other troop-contributing countries for the commitment they have shown to peace and the United Nations and for their valuable work in this area. Spain believes in improving the channels of communication between troop-contributing countries and the Security Council, and in better links between those countries and the work of the Council, in keeping with articles 43 and 44 of the Charter of the United Nations. Given the continuing responsibilities we are dealing with, Spain will work to that end.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine.

Mr. Sergeyev (Ukraine): Thank you for convening this very important meeting, Mr. President.

Ukraine aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union. I would also like to make a few specific points in my national capacity.

I would like to take note of the briefing on military helicopters in support of peacekeeping operations given by the Secretariat in February, which my delegation considered extremely important. We acknowledged the progress we achieved last year, especially in increasing the rate of utilization of combat helicopters to 70 per cent. We are working with the Secretariat on reaching our common goal, which is to close the current gap. In that regard, we fully support the ideas of regularly

reviewing force requirements through mission capability studies, improving letter-of-assist incentives and continued synergies through inter-mission cooperation.

Last year, at the Secretariat's request, we doubled our military aviation unit in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Having recognized the added value of inter-mission cooperation in terms of military advantages, cost-effectiveness and promoting regional approaches to regional issues, Ukraine has been a pioneer of this innovative form of peacekeeping. In particular, my country has been a major contributor for a number of years to this kind of cooperation between the United Nations Mission in Liberia and the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire.

The latest example of inter-mission cooperation — aimed at filling critical gaps in the United Nations Mission in South Sudan — has been a good demonstration of the benefits and challenges of such inter-mission deployment, which in general are similar for both police and military components. We believe that both the Secretariat and Member States have drawn appropriate lessons from that example and that appropriate measures have been undertaken for improving future arrangements. At a time when threats in regions of conflict are growing and United Nations mission budgets are being downsized, we believe that inter-mission cooperation, especially in military aviation, can be one of the most effective instruments for fast, appropriate responses by the United Nations to new challenges at the lowest possible cost.

Turning to the issue of triangular cooperation, a cornerstone of my delegation's position remains the need for closer, more transparent and effective cooperation in peacekeeping between all stakeholders. We can only welcome the fact that United Nations peacekeeping continues to figure prominently on the Security Council's agenda, as both a general and a country-specific issue. We have also taken positive note of some fresh practical elements, but there is still much room for improvement. In particular, we would like to encourage the Council to make the practice and timing of the adoption of peacekeeping mandates, including the renewal of inter-mission support mechanisms, more friendly for troop-contributing-countries (TCCs). Whenever feasible, taking relevant decisions well in advance of target dates would give TCCs and police-contributing countries enough breathing space to bring new or extended Security Council mandates in line with their national legislation, thus facilitating the timely deployment of their national units.

The growing contribution of and demand for United Nations police assistance in post-conflict environments is clear. The complexity of current and anticipated future missions points to an immediate need for enhanced strategic thinking and wider political support for United Nations police activity. In particular, my delegation notes positively the ongoing development of a strategic guidance framework aimed at promoting standardization within the United Nations police and welcomes the preparation of the new vision and multi-year strategy of the Police Division.

In line with the subject of today's debate, we would like to stress the need for a more systematic response on the part of United Nations police to the evolving threats to international peace and security represented by transnational organized crime, terrorism and integrated border management. The Police Division has already taken critical steps forward with its West Africa Coast Initiative, which provides basic and specialized training, technical and operational support, but further strengthening of the police components' efforts in this area is crucial. More intensive utilization of the expertise of the standing police capacity in addressing these challenges could be considered as an addition to overall efforts in this area.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Philippines.

Mr. Cabactulan (Philippines): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this timely and relevant meeting. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive and detailed briefing, which provides a context for this important discussion of new trends in United Nations peacekeeping operations.

This open debate comes at a crucial juncture for our Organization. Since 1948, when the United Nations pioneered its peacekeeping operations, the world has witnessed transformative events and massive changes in the global geopolitical landscape. Traditional threats continue, but of course there are now new and developing ones, including non-State actors with real capabilities for asymmetrical offences. The operational area has likewise evolved considerably, presenting a political milieu that is increasingly complex and complicated. Given these and many other challenges,

our United Nations peacekeeping operations continue to face increasing constraints, particularly with regard to resources.

These realities should not deter us from the great task and duty of this Organization, which is to maintain international peace and security. The Philippines has ably demonstrated its commitment to contributing to that task. What we have done so far is very modest, but our determination is certainly much bigger. With real and present danger to the safety and security of Filipino peacekeepers, my Government has continued to honour its international peacekeeping commitment in a testament to the unwavering resolve of my nation and people to hold the line of peace where it matters.

It is certainly incumbent on us all to act with responsibility and to do our part to ensure the success of peacekeeping missions. While the challenges confronting those missions may change, several elements must remain constant and must be enhanced — for instance, the setting of clear and achievable mandates; the provision of human resources and logistical support; a commitment to the safety and security of peacekeepers; the demonstration by stakeholders of the political will necessary for respect for the mandates, commitments and deals of peacekeeping missions and of all others relating to peacekeepers' freedom of movement; and responsive and timely policy recommendations from the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

That said, we must be forward-looking and strategically oriented to ensure that peacekeeping missions remain steady and able to anticipate and to respond to new and emerging challenges and identifiable trends. The concept note (S/2014/384, annex) raises interesting points for the Philippines, and we would like to provide the following comments.

Our first remark is that the Philippines notes the observation made that mandates for robust peacekeeping operations point to the need to assess their effectiveness and impact on the image of the Organization. Likewise, it is important to seriously consider the impact of such kinds of mandates on United Nations personnel, including the humanitarian and civilian staff working on the ground in peacekeeping operations. The Philippines belongs to the top three nations with international civilian staff in United Nations peacekeeping and political missions.

The Philippines expresses its concern over the observation that there may be a possible increase in the casualty rate of troops as a result of their direct participation in hostilities in situations where threats arise from non-governmental armed groups. That underscores the need to build the self-defence capability of peacekeepers, consistent with the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (A/68/19). The Philippines looks forward to the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of that report.

Secondly, the Philippines maintains that the use of modern technology must uphold the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, namely, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States, and must comply with the fundamental principles of peacekeeping. The use of modern technology for the situational awareness of peacekeeping missions is recognized. However, it must be stressed that the control and confidentiality of the information collected are issues that must be addressed.

On the need for peacekeeping missions to have the necessary resources, the model of the temporary transfer of personnel and equipment between missions in case of gaps is duly noted. While its effectiveness has been demonstrated in several cases, missions must be provided with the wherewithal to address very serious security challenges. In the same manner, it must also be stressed that the practice of temporarily transferring personnel and equipment within a mission in the event of gaps must be minimized. Philippine peacekeepers have had to deal with that scenario in the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for an extended period.

Our third point is that it must also be stressed that partnership and coordination among troop-contributing countries (TCCs), police-contributing countries (PCCs), the Council and the Secretariat, as well as the relevant stakeholders, are vital to ensuring the successful implementation of peacekeeping mandates. However, while it is welcome and extremely useful that such new ideas exist to bring us closer to what we truly want to achieve in peacekeeping operations, there are currently issues facing us that must be addressed and for which durable and timely solutions must be found. Otherwise, there is the danger that those new ideas will come to nothing.

First, pandemics and diseases constitute emerging threats. Additional studies to enhance the ability of peacekeeping missions to address them would be most welcome. Secondly, care must be taken to ensure that missions, through effective standard

operating procedures, do not leave behind a footprint that negatively affects the environment and the local population. Thirdly, commitments and agreements must lead to concrete provision. We now have the results of the survey conducted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 67/261 on the deficit between the current United Nations reimbursement rate to TCCs and PCCs and the high financial costs incurred by those countries. A decision that increases the standard rate of reimbursement to TCCs and PCCs must soon be adopted to ensure the success of peacekeeping missions.

Finally, we would also like to express our alignment with the statement on this topic to be delivered by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Meza-Cuadra (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I commend your initiative, Mr. President, to convene an open debate on developments in United Nations peacekeeping operations. We also thank the Secretary-General for his presentation.

A founding principle of the Organization's establishment was the maintenance of international peace and security. Peacekeeping operations are therefore are a crucial part of United Nations activities. Aware of that, Peru has actively participated in such operations since 1958, the year in which we deployed a contingent to the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon. Since that date, my country has contributed more than 6,700 uniformed personnel, three of whom have made the ultimate sacrifice in the defence of international peace and security.

The nature and characteristics of the conflicts that the Organization has had to face in recent decades have substantially changed. Likewise, in recent years we have witnessed a necessary change in the scope of the mandates of peacekeeping operations. Currently, such operations are therefore multidimensional in nature, since their mandates include various interrelated factors, such as peace and security, development, post-conflict capacity-building and State institution-building, among other elements.

The establishment of operations with multidimensional mandates implies a greater complexity not only on the ground but also in terms of the planning and implementation of those operations. Therefore, when establishing such operations, strict attention must be paid not only to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations but also to the guiding principles of such operations, namely, the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force except in legitimate self-defence or in defence of the mandate.

In that regard, we reiterate that the perception of the impartiality of peacekeeping missions is essential to their legitimacy in the field, the safety of their staff and their long-term effectiveness. In that connection, while we recognize the achievements of the Force Intervention Brigade of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in protecting civilians, my delegation believes that, in accordance with resolution 2098 (2013), the offensive activities of that Brigade should in no way be a precedent to justify similar mandates in the future. In that regard, the future scope of the activities of such operations must be discussed in the competent body of the Organization, namely, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of the General Assembly.

The increasing complexity of the mandates of peacekeeping operations requires greater coordination among the Security Council, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and troop-contributing countries so as to ensure that their perspectives and views with regard to the development, implementation and renewal of mandates are properly heard, given that their troops will be responsible for effectively implementing the mandate on the ground. In that context, uniformed personnel should have access to better training and policy-awareness facilities and to new technologies. Such operations must also enjoy adequate financial resources. It is therefore essential to review the scale of the cost of contingents, given that there is currently a large gap between the real cost of the troops in the field and the sums received by States. That jeopardizes the proper functioning of peacekeeping operations.

Peru believes that peace is not limited to the absence of conflict. That is why we support peacekeeping operations undertaking not only law enforcement activities but also comprehensive actions that contribute to building national structures and processes to bring about a lasting and sustainable peace. It is therefore essential to reaffirm the principle of national ownership in the understanding that peacebuilding should be an inherently national process, in which peacekeeping operations are limited to supporting the

national authorities in coordinating their peacebuilding and development priorities.

Finally, my country would like to underscore the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts. That highlights the need to promote their full participation in maintaining and promoting peace and security. Peru has therefore been increasing the participation of female staff, who currently account for 8 per cent of our personnel deployed in eight peacekeeping operations.

I wish to reiterate Peru's steadfast commitment to peacekeeping operations, which is reflected, inter alia, in our ongoing participation in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti for a decade. We are ready to maintain that commitment until the mission completes its task of Haiti's stabilization and reconstruction.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Koncke (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, let me thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate of the Security Council to address the issue of peacekeeping operations, with a focus on new trends. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his statement and his participation in this very relevant discussion.

I would like to begin my statement by stressing that the main objective of Uruguay's participation in peacekeeping operations is neither international prestige nor improvement in the quality or training of its troops and equipment, but the ethical and moral categorical imperative and solidarity with our Latin American colleagues and with countries in serious situations of conflict and instability, as well as to contribute to the fulfilment of the primary value reflected in the United Nations Charter, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security.

In that regard, I note that Uruguay, a country which has battalions deployed in some of the more complex scenarios, attaches greater importance to dialogue, consultation and interaction with all those that directly or indirectly influence the work of our Blue Helmets. For that reason, when we talk about new trends in the maintenance of peace, we must take into account the importance of the participation of troop-contributing countries (TCCs) in the formulation of policy and in the decision-making process in order to achieve a true partnership and strengthen the link between policy formulation and its implementation in the field, highlighting the need for real triangular cooperation among the TCCs, the Secretariat and the Security Council. Consultation with the TCCs is therefore recommended in all cases, but especially in the cases of robust mandates because of their scope and the possible implications that I will now discuss.

It is well known that my country, one of the main contributors of troops to the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, believes that it is outside the appropriate conceptual framework to have established, through resolution 2098 (2013), a Force Intervention Brigade that exceeds the traditional definition of peacekeeping operations. Accordingly, my Government believes that peacekeeping operations should restrict their use of force to cases of legitimate self-defence and defence of the mandate. We are concerned about the impact of the Brigade's actions in relation to the protection of civilians. It also shares the concern of other TCCs with respect to the possible impact that the Brigade could have on the safety of peacekeepers deployed and on the principle of impartiality.

Beyond that issue of substance, my country would also point out that, in that instance, there was no prior consultation with the TCCs at the time that the new peacekeeping capacity was being developed. Moreover, the establishment of more robust mandates, such as the aforementioned mandate and others, makes it all the more relevant for troops to have more training, more capacity and more material resources, including financial resources, in order to guarantee effective implementation of those mandates.

Despite recognition of the fact that one of the greatest challenges facing Member States in the current global financial climate is the scarcity of resources. It is obvious that the standard reimbursement rates require adjustments to reflect the rising costs for TCCs in the light of the results of the recent survey that was conducted and where my country was selected to be one of the samples. As a result, after many years of stalemate, it is crucial to take advantage of this opportunity to create a better financial incentive structure for the troop-contributing countries. In that regard, Uruguay reaffirms the need for a dynamic, open and constructive dialogue in order to reach a fair and reasonable agreement in this area and in other closely related areas of sustainability and efficiency in peacekeeping operations.

Along the same line of reasoning, we think it clear that while peacekeeping operations need financial resources, they also need to guarantee that the temporary assignment of human resources and necessary equipment to one peacekeeping operation does not take place to the detriment of another peacekeeping operation. Therefore, while we share the view that inter-mission cooperation might serve to overcome certain specific, contingent circumstances, inter-mission cooperation should be designed in such a way as to have no negative impact on the safety of the Blue Helmets, on their effectiveness and/or on their ability to fulfil the mandate of one mission to the benefit of another.

The Uruguayan Government notes with interest the development of modern technology and how it can enhance the effectiveness and safety of peacekeeping operations. The use of new technologies such as unmanned aerial vehicles can, on the one hand, provide an effective resource for peacekeeper safety and with regard to early warning, and be a very valuable source of inside information. On the other hand, it also raises the question of the lack of an agreed policy on their use and on the issue of the various aspects related to the management, use and confidentiality of information obtained through that tool. Nevertheless, we trust that, in a reinvigorated dialogue, Member States will be able to reach an agreement that sets forth transparent and clearly defined rules on the subject.

Uruguay sees the peacekeeping agenda from a systemic perspective and favours the inclusion of a sound component of early peacebuilding and mission development. It also has extensive experience as a troop-contributing country and thus has demonstrated commitment to the system, out of the conviction that it is the best bet for the defence of international peace and security and for respect for the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and international law. For all of these reasons, I can assure the Council that we will very closely follow the development of new trends in peacekeeping and seek to contribute to the dialogue with what we have learned from our long experience on the ground, as well as with ongoing political commitment from my Government to the peace and security agenda.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ethiopia.

Mr. Alemu (Ethiopia): Permit me to begin by expressing appreciation to the Russian Federation for organizing today's open debate on the important topic of new trends in peacekeeping under the agenda item entitled "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations". We also thank you, Mr. President, for the concept note (S/2014/384, annex), which is extremely useful and raises most of the pertinent issues in connection with new trends in peacekeeping. The concern expressed and the reference made in the concept paper to the fragmented nature of the approach towards the new developments that United Nations peacekeeping is called upon to respond to, appear to us to be very valid and pertinent. The fact that such concerns call for a serious look into the whole concept of peacekeeping, including doctrine and principles, is becoming undeniable. I also wish to express my appreciation to the Secretary-General for his statement earlier and to commend his leadership.

It is obvious that, at the intergovernmental level, the task of formulating the concepts and strategies of peacekeeping in the new period we seem to be in belongs to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. Undoubtedly, the Special Committee would have to be up to the task, for the task is indeed very critical. The contribution of the Secretary-General is also going to be indispensable in that exercise.

In what follows, I want to highlight how urgent this new thinking about peacekeeping is becoming. Failure to adopt this new thinking might eventually discredit the entire idea of United Nations peacekeeping operations. That would be a tragedy indeed, as United Nations peacekeeping continues to be a vital means for promoting peace, security and stability. However, the work of finding and developing universally agreed concepts, doctrine and strategies for new practices in peacekeeping must be speeded up.

Current peacekeeping practices are displaying certain anomalies that do not help to enhance the credibility of United Nations peacekeeping. In some instances, the deployment of Blue Helmets is considered to inappropriate because, the argument goes, there is no peace to keep. However, increasingly, as experiences in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Mali have shown, developments on the ground have made it imperative to use force beyond what is required for self-defence. The experience in Côte d'Ivoire highlights the same trend in a more graphic manner. Those are indeed ad hoc arrangements that lack the underpinnings of well thought-out and agreed principles and doctrine.

That is why it is difficult, for now, to think of abandoning the principles that have been the basis for

classical peacekeeping. However, we cannot pretend that there are no problems with respect to the way in which those principles are interpreted and applied. That also requires some serious thinking, if we are to rectify the situation. Thailand has already mentioned some of the points I would like to raise in that regard.

The principle of impartiality, no doubt, needs to be upheld, but that must not lead to a search for middle ground between a claim that is manifestly unjust and unfair, on one hand, and one with demands that are limited to the protection of universally recognized rights. It is also possible that the principle of the consent of the parties could be interpreted in such a way as to cause it to lose meaning. There are groups that are so far beyond the pale that asking for their consent might be both unwise and impractical. We have indeed begun to encounter more of such instances lately. We should also not overlook the fact that there might be situations, as the Secretary-General indicated earlier, in which it is difficult to identify the parties. The idea of the non-use of force except in self-defence might lead to peacekeepers focusing more on their own safety, even in the face of potential mass atrocities and civilians facing mortal danger.

All of this requires serious debate, as do the new trends in the use of high-tech equipment and advanced technologies and the related political, ethical and other issues that can legitimately be raised. But again, all of that is also the result of changes on the ground and the evolution of the challenges that United Nations peacekeeping is called upon to address. It is impossible to deny that there are changes taking place. That is the beginning of wisdom and progress in this area.

The other point that this debate should take into account is the increasing role of regional mechanisms in the area of peacekeeping. In that regard, we wish to emphasize the need for further strengthening of cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations such as the African Union in the areas of policy formulation, capacity-building and burden sharing.

Unfortunately, Africa continues to host over 70 per cent of United Nations peacekeeping forces, indicating the level of the peace and security deficit in the continent. It would therefore be no exaggeration to say that the success of peacekeeping efforts in Africa will significantly determine the overall effectiveness of that endeavour. To address this monumental challenge, Africa, for its part, is building the African Peace and Security Architecture, including the African Standby Force. Here also, there is a need to flexible in the way the collaboration is carried out.

We are of the view that supporting the African Union and its institutional capacity to effectively plan, deploy and manage peace support missions should be considered a critical aspect of the overall objective of the maintenance of international peace and security. No doubt that will require greater partnership, inclusiveness and purposeful leadership. We commend the Secretariat and the African Union for the efforts exerted thus far.

Finally, Ethiopia applauds the many achievements of United Nations peacekeeping over more than 60 years and feels honoured to have been associated with that noble endeavour since its inception. We honour the sacrifices of the men and women who have served under the blue United Nations flag — military, police, and civilians — in the furtherance of peace. We remember in particular and with deepest gratitude those who have lost their lives in the service of world peace.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia.

Ms. Adnin (Malaysia): At the outset, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, and the Russian Federation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I would like to also express my delegation's appreciation to you for convening this important open debate and for the well-written and thought-provoking concept note (S/2014/384, annex) prepared for this event.

My delegation believes that this debate provides an excellent opportunity to exchange views and raise awareness on new developments affecting United Nations peacekeepers in the field today. Indeed, our discussion today is timely in the light of the recent commemoration of the memorial International Day of United Nations Peacekeepers on 29 May 2014. As a regular contributor to United Nations peacekeeping operations, Malaysia has committed a total of 932 personnel serving in 7 missions. Since 1960, Malaysia has participated in 30 such missions, with a total commitment of 29,000 personnel to date.

United Nations peacekeeping has seen an exponential growth in both size and scope since the 1990s. At present, the Council has authorized 16 peacekeeping operations across the globe, with around 116,000 personnel from more than 120 countries,

who are often deployed at great personal risk. The sheer number of peacekeeping missions and the number of personnel deployed demonstrates the international community's continued reliance on the United Nations as the central pillar for maintaining international peace and security. As such, it may be concluded that peacekeeping operations are a significant and critical component of the international community's efforts in confronting crisis and bringing peace, stability and reconciliation to war-torn countries around the world.

Over the years, the scope of activities undertaken by United Nations peacekeepers has also evolved, from traditional peacekeeping work to more robust and multidimensional operations involving a broad spectrum of activities. As the scope of peacekeeping activities becomes more complex and multidimensional, our blue helmets are confronted with new threats and challenges. Among others, such challenges include ambushes and attacks on peacekeeping convoys and the hostage-taking of Blue Helmets in some conflict zones.

As a troop-contributing country, Malaysia is concerned by such developments. In particular, we are concerned by the seeming regularity of such incidents, which appear to have become a new modus operandi for certain armed groups in several conflict zones. Against such disturbing developments, my delegation notes the Security Council's decision to deploy the Force Intervention Brigade in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In our view, that deployment could represent one possible solution to the dilemma increasingly face by United Nations peacekeeping missions. We further note that the Council's authorization for the Brigade to use all necessary measures to avoid violent attacks is an important evolution of the peacekeeping mandate, which could help to ensure the safety and security of Blue Helmets.

Those measures, however, need to be carried out with clear mandates and proper training. On that note, Malaysia wishes to reaffirm its support for resolution 2086 (2013), which in our view provides a comprehensive blueprint and guidance for a multidimensional approach to peacekeeping operations. My delegation notes that the resolution covers a large spectrum of means to address multiple challenges and tasks, which not only aims to enhance the effectiveness of peacekeeping efforts, but also peacebuilding and other conflict prevention efforts. In that connection, Malaysia shares the view that all peacekeepers should be provided with proper equipment, security perimeters and vehicles that would allow them to operate safely.

My delegation also believes that, as and when the need arises, inter-mission cooperation could be considered in order to temporarily fill critical gaps, so as to effectively respond to unforeseen events in certain peacekeeping operations. For instance, a small-scale temporary deployment of personnel and equipment from the closest or neighbouring missions to an existing mission faced with an unexpected demand for such resources could yield positive results.

Malaysia also shares the view that the emergence of new military technologies should continue to benefit peacekeeping operations. For example, the use of modern technology, such as unmanned aerial vehicles, could significantly improve the situational awareness of peacekeepers, which in turn would enhance their safety and security. In addition, the use of other modern technology and devices, such as geographic imaging systems, satellite imagery and ground surveillance radar could be utilized in peacekeeping operations to strengthen monitoring and surveillance capacities and their abilities to implement the mandates of their respective missions. We are of the view, however, that the use of technology in peacekeeping operations should also take into account the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

The issue of financing peacekeeping operations has become one of the major challenges at the United Nations. Not all troop-contributing countries are in a position to be equipped with modern technologies and devices. In addition, most modern equipment has to be procured from private companies. Such a practice could lead to a double-edged sword as there is potential that some confidential information could be leaked to a third party. In that regard, Malaysia believes that there is a need to study how best to address that issue. We are of the view that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations could consider establishing a mechanism to verify and ensure that all confidential data and information is restricted to relevant United Nations bodies and agencies.

At the same time, my delegation also holds the view that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations should adopt a more comprehensive and effective approach to generate resources to meet the demands of the new multidimensional mandates. In view of the increasing need for such mandates, the United Nations requires an adequate and optimum level of forces, as well as

equipment in order to operate effectively and efficiently. As a Member State that strongly supports the United Nations peacekeeping role, Malaysia supports all efforts for transparent triangular cooperation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop- and police-contributing countries.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its commitment to continue working together with all partners and stakeholders in our collective effort to advance the cause of international peace and security through the United Nations peacekeeping agenda.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mr. Patriota (Brazil): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate on a topic of paramount importance to the United Nations in general, and the Security Council, in particular. United Nations Members need to be fully aware of the constant evolution of peacekeeping operations in practical and conceptual terms, and it is appropriate, in that sense, that Security Council members maintain a regular exchange of views with the broader membership on a matter of such strategic importance. I also thank the Secretary-General for his briefing.

Brazil renews its strong commitment to United Nations peacekeeping operations and its readiness to work with a view to their improvement. In Haiti, Lebanon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in many other locations, Brazilian military and police uphold the noble principles that continue to preside over United Nations peacekeeping operations.

War between States continues to be the most dangerous and potentially destructive form of conflict, as we can observe from the widespread resurgence of geopolitical tensions in sensitive regions of the world. This new "old" trend is all the more worrisome when we consider that many countries continue to stockpile weapons of mass destruction.

Civilians are the main victims of conflicts today. They are victims not only of the collapse of State structures and the ensuing violence, but also of the unauthorized use of force or the provision of weapons by third parties. As a result, we bear witness to the proliferation of cases of humanitarian emergencies with a corresponding increase in the demand for the institutional building of capacities, which in the absence of other capable institutions, must be provided by peacekeeping missions — particularly in the domains of security and justice.

Peacekeeping is destined to remain one of the main tools at the disposal of the international community to address international threats to peace and security. United Nations peacekeeping has become more complex and dangerous. Nowadays, there is more to peacekeeping than military patrols along a ceasefire line or the observation of the parties to ensure separation and compliance with agreements. United Nations peacekeeping operations have recently been deployed in areas where no peace agreements are in place and where Government authority is weak or non-existent.

The implications of being a troop- or police-contributing country, therefore, have been changing quickly. The evolution of peacekeeping missions entailed the renewed commitment of troop-contributing countries in deploying their citizens in riskier and more demanding operations. Enhanced efforts in predeployment training, high standards for equipment and the contribution of a large array of specialized units are nowadays common features.

In keeping with those developments, the strengthened peacekeeping partnership will be possible only if we adopt a fair reimbursement rate. As discussions on that issue take place in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, we expect all partners to adopt a responsible position regarding that matter. There can be no question that United Nations peacekeeping efforts are cost-effective and that, despite constraints, the United Nations does a lot with very little. For evidence, one need look no further than to the stark contrast between the United Nations peacekeeping budget of around $8 billion a year and the nuclear Powers' defence expenditure in 2013, which totalled $991 billion, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

In spite of that, regrettably the Department of Peacekeeping Operations has been grappling with the contradictory dynamics of ever-more complex mandates, on the one hand, and increasing pressure for budget reductions, on the other. Whereas there is no contradiction in trying to ensure that all resources in any given mission are spent in the most effective manner, efforts to impose artificial caps to overall expenditures in peacekeeping operations will turn out to be detrimental to our collective efforts to fulfil our responsibilities under the Charter.

At the same time, special political missions are increasingly acquiring characteristics similar to multidimensional peacekeeping operations, even though they are funded by the regular budget of the Organization. It is a classic case of taxation without representation, considering that the Security Council determines the establishment of a special political mission, but the costs are spread as if it were a decision of the General Assembly. Let us not forget that more than 20 per cent of the United Nations regular budget is currently destined to the maintenance of special political missions, negatively impacting the capacity of the United Nations to adequately carry out mandates in other areas, in particular as regards development assistance.

If resources are scarce when it comes to peacekeeping operations, they are blatantly insufficient to assure development assistance and post-conflict peacebuilding. In certain parts of the world, international challenges to peace and security find their root causes in poverty, social exclusion, discrimination and impunity before the law. Without addressing those root causes, there can be little hope that a stable and peaceful situation will ensue.

The integration of peacekeeping and peacebuilding initiatives is therefore crucial for the long-standing stabilization of States emerging from conflict. It would be a serious setback if new peacekeeping operation trends in an environment of resource constraints lead to the prevalence of military solutions, in detriment to multidimensional mandates that include parallel, effective peacebuilding efforts.

Whenever it is requested to deal with a situation, the Security Council should, from the earliest possible stages of the peacekeeping mandate-drafting, look beyond the immediate horizon of events into the root causes of conflicts, and develop long-lasting strategies for peace. Improved interaction between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission is of the essence in that regard.

Let me touch upon recent trends in peacekeeping operations. The first is the growing use of inter-mission cooperation. Brazil recognizes the potential benefits of inter-mission cooperation, especially as a tool for quickly responding to crises. However, it cannot be envisaged as a cost-reduction instrument. Operational, administrative and financial arrangements related to inter-mission cooperation cannot result in actions that fill a gap while opening another.

The second aspect is the deployment of modern technological resources. Brazil views the incorporation of technology into peacekeeping operations as an inevitable development. However, technical means such as unmanned, unarmed aerial systems may have their potential usefulness negated if their use results in a smaller number of well-equipped and trained soldiers on the ground. The investment in new technologies will be effective only if paralleled by investment in the necessary human resources.

Another aspect worth examining is the collaboration between the Council and regional organizations. This is most visible with regard to the commendable role assumed by the African Union in peacekeeping efforts in Africa. Surely, regional appropriation of regional issues is a development we must applaud, on the understanding that applicable provisions of the Charter of the United Nations are being strictly observed.

At the same time, one should not overlook the need for international assistance in support of those initiatives. It is unfair to assume that the African Union will be able to provide, alone, the resources indispensable to the adequate fulfillment of missions whose mandates are ever-more complex and ambitious. As a rule, neither regional organizations nor the United Nations should outsource their respective responsibilities in the provision of international peace and security.

Peacekeeping operations concern all Member States and need to be thoroughly and democratically discussed. A reformed Security Council that is more representative of the contemporary world would have the increased legitimacy needed to craft demanding peacekeeping operation mandates that are attuned to the aspirations of the wider membership and can therefore enlist the support of a greater number of troop-contributing countries towards the achievement of common goals.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Hilale (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for your initiative in convening this debate under the theme "United Nations peacekeeping operations: new trends". It confirms Russia's role as a great country that is faithful and committed to peace and international security. I also thank the Russian delegation for the concept note submitted to the Council (S/2014/384, annex). It is

comprehensive and raises important questions that are relevant to today's debate.

While I align myself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, my delegation wishes to emphasize the following aspects, which we consider essential and useful in addressing United Nations peacekeeping issues.

Dynamic in nature, peacekeeping operations have gradually evolved from missions with limited mandates to monitor ceasefires, mainly involving inter-State conflicts, into complex multidimensional operations, including military, police, civilian and humanitarian components and often operating in situations of internal conflict. These new challenges require extensive discussion on ways to strengthen peacekeeping operations and make them more effective and efficient.

In that spirit, Morocco — as an African troop-contributing country that since 1960 has deployed Moroccan troops in many operations around the world, as evidenced by the participation of more than 60,000 of our personnel in 13 peacekeeping operations deployed in four continents — wishes to contribute to establishing an ambitious goal that can narrow the gap between New York and the reality on the ground. This objective can be achieved only through dialogue, interaction and collective analysis.

Beyond the basic requirements, any successful peacekeeping operation, whatever its nature, is linked to interrelated factors such as realistic mandates established by the Council; triangular cooperation among the Secretariat, troop-contributing countries and the administrative body dealing with the planning and implementation of the mandates; and proper exit strategies accompanied by measures to ensure sustainable development.

All these activities and strategies must continue to respect the basic principles governing United Nations peacekeeping, including the consent of the parties, impartiality, the non-use of force except in legitimate self-defence, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries concerned, non-interference in their internal, and the consideration of the specificities of each situation. Furthermore, and in order to ensure that peacekeeping operations enjoy every possible chance of success, it is essential that the Council's mandates be fully respected by all of the affected parties when they are implemented on the ground.

Turning now to inter-mission cooperation, my delegation is convinced of the growing relevance of that approach. It led us to organize, during the Moroccan presidency of the Council in December 2012, a debate devoted specifically with the topic (see S/PV.6886). The debate highlighted the full potential of such cooperation and identified the challenges to be overcome. We concluded that this tool had many advantages in terms of optimizing the use of resources and filling logistics gaps in crisis, but that it should not be considered a long-term solution to the numerous structural problems that hinder effective peacekeeping.

Regarding the use of new technologies in peacekeeping operations and stressing the importance of the potential contributions of such technologies to peacekeeping operations, we note that this issue requires further consideration, given that new technologies are not always operational. Further consideration of the use of new technologies is therefore important, as is consensus on the issue in order to clarify all aspects of using such technology.

In conclusion, I take this opportunity to offer a strong tribute, on behalf of my country, to the peacekeeping personnel and operations on the ground, who carry out a noble mission in often difficult circumstances. I pay particular tribute to those who risk their lives to save those others. While hoping that today's debate will inspire useful ideas leading to specific measures to improve and enhance peacekeeping operations, I stress that my country's commitment to peacekeeping is ongoing and has remained so since its independence. It reflects an ongoing resolve to enshrine the concept of international peace and collective security that underlies the existence of our Organization.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

Mr. Ibuge (United Republic of Tanzania): The United Republic of Tanzania welcomes this open debate on the theme "United Nations peacekeeping operations: new trends". We especially thank the Russian presidency for organizing the debate and for its incisive concept note on the subject (S/2014/384, annex). We also thank the Secretary-General for his remarkable introductory statement this morning.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement to be made by the representative of the Republic of

Malawi on behalf of the Southern African Development Community.

The fact that United Nations peacekeeping operations have reached an important juncture in the Organization's history may sound like a cliché, but I should like to indulge in it nevertheless. When the United Nations peacekeeping enterprise began more than 60 years ago, none of its founders, who defined that noble undertaking, could have foreseen that contemporary peacekeeping operations would have to navigate through the waters they must sail through today. The multidimensional reality of United Nations peacekeeping operations means that they must now include ever more complex mandates at the tactical, operational and strategic levels. Such characteristics have developed from necessity.

The reality is that the nature of the conflicts that peacekeeping operations must confront today, in particular the settling of intra-State conflicts, neither justifies nor warrants us to lose sight of what those operations are intended to be and must continue to be. In that regard, I will identify but a few salient points.

First, United Nations peacekeeping operations must invariably adhere to the agreed basic principles of peacekeeping, namely, the consent of the parties to the conflict, impartiality, and the non-use of force except in self-defence and in defence of their mandates. Indeed, those are time-tested principles essential to the maintenance of the credibility and legitimacy of the flagship activity of the United Nations that is peacekeeping.

Secondly, we need to ensure that we remain clear-eyed about the challenges faced by contemporary United Nations peacekeeping operations and those whom we deploy to implement the mandates. Almost everywhere an active peacekeeping operation exists, including current deployments, the intra-State nature of most conflicts is a phenomenon that we cannot wish away. Today, the focus of most United Nations peacekeeping operations with Chapter VII mandates is to ensure the protection of civilians. Undoubtedly, the overall implementation of that primary responsibility must remain that of the host-country Government, however weak it may appear, so long as it maintains legitimacy with the majority of its population. In that regard, United Nations peacekeeping operations must work closely and in tandem with the host Government. The mission must offer support to the host country in its attempt to achieve the priorities its polity deems necessary to enable it to restore sustainable peace and attain the sociopolitical harmony and economic development its population deserves.

Thirdly, when a Government's capacity to exercise authority within part of its territory is manifestly weak, the commission of atrocities and impunity for such crimes are likely to reign. That reality may become even graver when the intentions of some armed belligerents may be purely criminal or terroristic. They are likely to be uninterested in any semblance of political dialogue, whether through mediation, conciliation or negotiations. At the same time, the danger they pose to the population and to peacekeepers has increased dramatically year after year. When such groups appear to focus solely on the personal aggrandizement and profiteering on the part of the individuals who control them, it is unlikely that there will be any motivation to achieve peace unless the United Nations mission is able to present a viable deterrence posture. Indeed, the activities of such rebel forces, which respect no national or international humanitarian law, keeps peacekeepers at great risk of their lives. The current toll of peacekeepers who have lost their lives — 106 in 2013 alone — reminds us of the perils that need to be addressed, including the impunity of those who attack peacekeepers.

Fourthly, as peacekeeping continues to move towards more Chapter VII mandates, there is a stark contradiction in the fact that United Nations peacekeeping operations have not been allocated adequate resources to implement them. The debate on the current global economic crunch, while pertinent, must not be one-sided. As cost-cutting, downsizing or right-sizing continues, the alternative narrative is that troop- and police-contributing countries end up bearing the brunt of the burden of peacekeeping. That is neither acceptable nor sustainable.

The Council must ensure that the mandates it sets not only are realistic but that they are commensurate to the resources allocated to the missions. In doing so, the Council will immensely benefit from the experience of troop- and police-contributing countries. Their active participation in all stages of a mission must therefore be the centre point of the triangular cooperation among the Council, the troop-and police-contributing countries, and the Secretariat.

Collectively addressing the question of new technologies in United Nations peacekeeping operations must be a goal of ongoing triangular engagement. Innovations that enable effective United Nations

peacekeeping operations must be clearly assessed in the light of their tactical and operational value, as well as their political and legal implications. This debate will ultimately require balancing views from across the United Nations membership, for peacekeeping operations have indeed been and must remain based on the collective and individual goodwill of the nations that participate in them.

In closing, we pay tribute to the men and women who have laid down their lives in the pursuit of peace under the United Nations flag. We honour their memories well, not by breaking the ranks of our international unity and will, but by appropriately ensuring the conditions necessary to enable them to confront the challenges in maintaining international peace and security that we collectively continue to face. That is why we remain these United Nations.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Senegal.

Mr. Diallo (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, Mr. President, allow me to extend our heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. I also welcome this opportunity to participate in this open debate, given its timeliness, on issues related to new trends in peacekeeping operations.

The evolving nature of conflicts, which have become increasingly complex and destabilizing, has led the Council in recent years to adapt peacekeeping operations with a view to improving efficiency in the implementation of operations to make or restore peace. That new orientation has resulted in granting more robust mandates to peacekeeping operations that have become multidimensional, and in the use of new surveillance technologies and inter-mission cooperation. Such new trends are the result of deep-seated changes that have arisen to grapple with the appearance of multiple threats to international peace and security.

Indeed, resurgent drug trafficking, human trafficking, terrorism and piracy at sea constitute factors for instability in many regions of the world. Moreover, conventional wars between States have largely given way to internal conflicts based on asymmetrical attacks that have a considerable impact on civilian populations. Operations have therefore shifted their focus from interposition towards intervention and the protection of civilians. This situation has led to an ongoing evolution in peacekeeping operations in a context where the ideals on which the United Nations was founded — peace, security, human rights and development — are more relevant than ever.

It is, however, the responsibility of the Council to carefully monitor the intended impact of peacekeeping practices and the results obtained over the course of their evolution. Considered in the light of mandates that are increasingly multidimensional and/or robust, peacekeeping operations seem to be more in line with the reality of the theatres of operation. The links among security, human rights, international humanitarian law and the political process of peacebuilding all demand the deployment of missions that are broadly prepared to prevent the resurgence of violence that often arises in pre- or post-electoral situations, in the aftermath of judicial procedures related to the settling of accounts, or from failed efforts at national reconciliation.

Moreover, priorities need to be ordered based on a long-term approach, along with a system of coordination capable of ensuring the established goals. Although that departs from the principle of neutrality that was considered important during the Cold War, granting a robust mandate can contribute fundamentally to the protection of civilian populations and to the restoration of the territorial integrity of States. Such mandates, however, are not without risk because they give United Nations forces a stakeholder role, which requires enhanced measures to ensure their safety.

The complexity of threats to peace and security has also led to the use of new technologies such as unarmed drones. Such reconnaissance and surveillance devices help to identify armed groups, prevent threats and facilitate a rapid response. In that regard, unarmed aerial vehicles are indispensable. However, it is important to preserve their exclusively military role through rigorous management of their acquisition and use and the information they generate. It is therefore necessary, within the framework of cooperation between the United Nations and subregional organizations, to ensure the transfer of technology capable of improving their ability to intervene.

Inter-mission cooperation is also a crucial question insofar as it touches on the overall effectiveness of contemporary peacekeeping operations. Indeed, it has the advantage of contributing to the strengthening of the operational skills of troops involved in establishing new missions, and of compensating for deficits in contingents that have already been deployed. In the same vein, I take this opportunity to call on Member

States to ensure payment of their assessed contributions on time and without preconditions, and for regular reimbursement for material and troops in order to improve the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations.

Peacekeeping operations raise the hopes of entire populations, reassure host Governments, facilitate the mission of humanitarian workers and contribute to the recovery of countries affected by conflict. It is therefore clear that respect for the sovereignty of States must prevail more than ever and be constantly reaffirmed. As we said during the open debate on security sector reform (see S/PV.7161), States affected by crises must be at the heart of the process of conceptualizing, preparing and deploying peacekeeping operations. Their very legitimacy and effectiveness depend on it.

To conclude, I would like to reaffirm the need to pursue the development of rapid and effective intervention capabilities. Senegal therefore calls for enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and the African Union in order to implement the significant recommendation of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) concerning the use of standby forces and the capabilities of the United Nations.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Viet Nam.

Mr. Le Hoai Trung (Viet Nam): First of all, I would like to thank the Russian presidency for convening this open debate on the theme "United Nations peacekeeping operations: new trends".

My delegation thanks the Secretary-General for his comprehensive briefing and the Secretariat, under his leadership, in particular the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support, for their important support for United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Allow me at the outset to pay tribute to the more than 118,000 men and women from 120 member States who are currently serving in 16 United Nations peacekeeping operations around the world. I have the honour to inform the Council and the United Nations membership that, starting from the end of this month, officers from the People's Army of Viet Nam will stand together with the men and women of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan. That is further testimony of Viet Nam's support for and commitment to United Nations peacekeeping operations, its unwavering willingness to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, and its continued engagement and cooperation with the United Nations and the international community. My country has also established the Viet Nam Peacekeeping Centre as a hub for training our future peacekeepers to ensure their professionalism, dynamism and high standards.

United Nations peacekeeping operations have indeed made significant contributions to reducing the threat of renewed conflicts and facilitating progress towards durable peace and sustainable development. In the face of the evolving nature of conflicts, United Nations peacekeeping operations have constantly expanded in size, mandates and complexity. Their multidimensional mandates today extend far beyond the traditional keeping of peace after conflict to cover the protection of civilians and the establishment of the necessary foundations for successful peacebuilding.

As we have learned from past experience, the success of United Nations peacekeeping operations requires strict adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and universally recognized guidelines, namely, the consent of the parties, the non-use of force except in self-defence, total impartiality, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, and non-interference in their internal affairs. At the same time, recent attacks targeting United Nations peacekeepers, which Viet Nam strongly condemns, compel us to ensure the highest possible standards of security and safety for peacekeepers. It is vital that peacekeeping missions be provided with sufficient resources to protect their peacekeepers in any situation.

As part of a comprehensive approach to conflicts, we believe that it is crucial to address the root causes of conflicts by engaging all parties involved on the basis of dialogue and the peaceful settlement of disputes; by finding long-term, comprehensive solutions to the political, security, economic and humanitarian dimensions of conflicts; and by strengthening efforts in preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, in accordance with international law.

As a troop-contributing country, Viet Nam remains committed to working with other troop-contributing countries, the United Nations and other partners in the joint endeavour to ensure strong, effective United Nations peacekeeping operations that can maintain their contribution to durable peace around the world.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Mahmoud (Egypt): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement. I would like to begin by congratulating the Russian Federation on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for June and for organizing this open debate on a very important and timely topic. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his important statement today.

As the concept paper (S/2014/384, annex) states, there is indeed a dire need for a thorough discussion among the relevant United Nations intergovernmental bodies if we are to develop a balanced United Nations approach, including through those bodies' regulatory documents, to address the new trends relating to peacekeeping missions, which in many ways differ drastically from the usual missions of past decades.

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) stresses that the development of concepts, policies and strategies should be done at the intergovernmental level, particularly the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, and should run parallel to similar efforts to improve development, planning and oversight capacities. NAM also emphasizes that policy development in peacekeeping must be coupled with the provision of the resources needed to ensure effective implementation of peacekeeping mandates. Accordingly, the Movement re-emphasizes its commitment to supporting all efforts to make peacekeeping operations more effective, and reiterates the following points.

First, we stress the importance of reaching consensus among Member States on policy development and ensuring that only ideas and approaches they have collectively agreed on are implemented. We call on the Secretariat to refrain from working on policy directions that have not been agreed on through an intergovernmental process. The Special Committee is and remains the sole body in charge of policymaking in peacekeeping.

Second, it is vital that all necessary support, including in the areas of financing and human resources as well as military and civilian capabilities, be provided to peacekeeping missions if they are to be able to fulfil their tasks within a framework of full respect for host countries and their laws and regulations. In that context, NAM particularly underscores the importance of drawing on the experience and expertise of troop-contributing countries (TCCs) when the Security Council implements, extends or adjusts United Nations peacekeeping mandates. In that regard, we emphasize the necessity for prior consultations with TCCs, which are best placed to contribute to an objective assessment of the situation on the ground.

Third, the results of the survey conducted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 67/261 clearly demonstrate the deficit between the current United Nations reimbursement rate to troop- and police-contributing countries and the high financial costs that those countries actually incur. It is important that the Assembly take a decision before the end of this month on increasing the standard rate of reimbursement in line with the survey results. As the resolution requested, all the information necessary for an informed decision has been collected. Now that this complex process has been completed, it is up to Member States to deal with increasing the rate of reimbursement in light of the results of the survey. The full implementation of the resolution's provisions will be guaranteed only when we agree on a new rate. NAM will not accept an interim or ad hoc solution to this issue again.

Fourth, we need a strong and clear commitment on the part of the Security Council to drafting clear and achievable mandates, based on an objective assessment, and without any rush to adopt mandates that lack a political basis or sufficient resources, or that are not practically achievable. Developing integrated planning and consistent approaches to achieving a link between policy formulation and implementation on the ground is crucial to success in this area.

Fifth, we stress the importance of troop-contributing countries' full participation in policy- and decision-making in order to achieve the partnership and effectiveness that United Nations peacekeeping missions require. NAM underlines the need for effective triangular cooperation among troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat and the Security Council.

Sixth, we emphasize that the establishment of any peacekeeping operation and the extension of existing operation mandates should strictly observe the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the basic principles that have evolved to govern such operations — that is, the consent of the parties, the non-use of force except in self-defence, and impartiality. NAM believes that these basic principles, which have

guided United Nations peacekeeping operations for the past five decades without controversy, remain relevant and should be preserved.

Seventh, NAM stresses that the use in peacekeeping operations of technology designed to enhance situational awareness, including unmanned aerial vehicles, should be conducted on a case-by-case basis and must uphold the principles enshrined in the Charter. We underscore the importance of considering the legal, operational, technical and financial implications of the use of such assets in the field in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations without further delay.

Eighth, we must enhance the integration of peacekeeping with peacebuilding, so that peacekeeping work is accompanied by economic recovery and capacity-building efforts on a basis of national ownership. The Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund have a significant role to play in that regard. The objective should not be to cut peacekeeping costs but to enhance the potential of States so as to avoid their relapse into conflict.

Lastly, the Movement strongly believes that primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the United Nations, and that the role of regional arrangements should be organized in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter. We call for intensified support on the part of the United Nations for the African Union's operations, by ensuring predictable and sustainable funding for those missions.

NAM, as the one group that includes most if not all of the top troop- and police-contributing countries, continues to support peacekeeping operations. Its member States have continued to increase their contributions to military and police components, as well as to civilian expertise, in United Nations peacekeeping missions, clear evidence of our commitment to maintaining international peace and security.

I would like to conclude by paying tribute to the men and women of the United Nations who are working to implement peacekeeping activities, as well as to those peacekeepers who have lost their lives in the field defending the flag of the United Nations and contributing to upholding the positive and noble image of the Organization and its peacekeeping operations.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this important and timely open debate on new trends in United Nations peacekeeping operations, and we appreciate your well-rounded and realistic concept paper (S/2014/384, annex). We also thank the Secretary-General for his briefing.

Indonesia aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Over the years, United Nations peacekeeping has indeed evolved to meet the changing and multidimensional demands of various conflicts. Indonesia concurs with the observation of the concept note that this evolution poses significant and higher security threats to Blue Helmets and civilian staff required to undertake a wide variety of complex tasks. It is therefore crucial that the increased demands on United Nations peacekeeping be met by adequate capabilities and resources, and that those demands be fully consistent with the agreed principles, guidelines and terminology governing peacekeeping.

As peacekeeping operations continue to evolve both conceptually and operationally, my delegation emphasizes that the three basic peacekeeping principles of the United Nations are indispensable. While innovation and flexibility within reasonable and safe parameters are required if we are to cope with the operations' multidimensional tasks, adherence to the basic principles will maintain the legitimacy and credibility of United Nations peacekeeping missions and support for them, ultimately paving the way for their success. Nothing must be done to damage that precious legitimacy and credibility, which has been hard-earned over many decades.

It is in that context that we see the need for making a clear distinction between peacekeeping and peace enforcement, as two completely different things. The Security Council's establishment of peacekeeping operations should not be used to enable interventions in other countries or to impose the interests of some countries on them. The expansion of a mission's mandate and its scope with regard to the use of force in the absence of a carefully laid-out and adequately supported comprehensive plan, constituting a credible political process, consultation and coordination, will jeopardize the mission's impartiality, along with its peacekeepers' safety and security.

In that regard, there is a need to outline an unambiguous and transparent description of robust United Nations peacekeeping operations. The development of concepts, policies and strategies should be an intergovernmental process. We must be mindful of the central role of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to comprehensively review the various aspects of United Nations peacekeeping and to give its recommendations thereon. The Secretariat should therefore refrain from developing policies or guidelines on peacekeeping without their intergovernmental discussion.

While the peacekeeping secretariat needs clear and timely guidance from Member States, too, it should enhance its very valuable work to improve the capacities, planning, oversight and backstopping of missions. We believe that the Secretariat can also play a greater role in enabling more meaningful interaction among troop- and police-contributing countries, host countries, the Security Council and itself. That is especially important in the early stages of formulating mission mandates or when they are modified subsequently. We call on the Security Council to engage more frequently and substantively with all peacekeeping stakeholders throughout all phases of a peacekeeping mission and to reflect the different concerns and expectations appropriately so that missions are more effective.

The use of modern technology as part of the new trends also needs to be discussed openly and transparently. While new technology can improve situational awareness and help to enhance peacekeepers' safety and security, we should be mindful that its implementation, including the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), should be considered on a case-by-case basis and should be in keeping with the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as United Nations peacekeeping. Moreover, the legal, technical and financial aspects of the use of and information gathering by UAVs should be examined and approved by all relevant actors.

Meanwhile, in the context of deploying the Force Intervention Brigade within the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, we should also carefully guide the discussion without creating a precedent, as it was agreed as an exceptional consideration.

We would like to support the call for the increase in the reimbursement rates for troop costs, daily allowances, mission factors and contingent-owned equipment on the basis of the actual expenses and investment of troop- and police-contributing countries.

Finally, with its current participation in eight United Nations peacekeeping missions, Indonesia will continue to strongly support and to contribute to United Nations efforts to lay the foundations for stable international peace. We again underscore the significance of a holistic, properly supported, consultative and coordinated approach to fostering peace and stability. For sustainable outcomes, the interlinkage among peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development should be seamless, nationally owned and fully supported by all relevant actors.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Malawi.

Mr. Msosa (Malawi): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) during this open debate of the Security Council on the topic of new trends in United Nations peacekeeping operations.

At the outset, let me express my appreciation to the Russian presidency for selecting the topic at hand. Indeed, this debate is not only timely but also of critical importance, especially given the very complex, multidimensional and dynamic nature of peacekeeping operations today. In order to genuinely engage in the debate on new trends facing the conduct of United Nations peacekeeping today, it is imperative that we establish the correct legal standing. The fact that the Security Council is the body mandated by the Charter of the United Nations to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security is an obligation that collectively binds us as a global membership, which we, as SADC, support.

At the same time, we should not lose sight of the fact that most current conflicts are intra-State, pitting legitimately elected Governments against armed groups, some of which may have clearly stated political goals, while others have none, with some of their declared leaders not able even to seek or recognize international mediation efforts. However, what often remains abundantly clear are the impunity of violence and the untold deaths, suffering and general socioeconomic deprivation that the majority of the innocent civilian population continue to face under such circumstances.

To that end, it remains the Security Council's responsibility to heed the plight of the innocent victims and to assist the legitimate sovereign authority of the

country concerned in restoring peace, while, at the same time, reaching out to and enabling the parties to the conflict to resolve their disagreements through negotiation. In addition, it must be ensured that such efforts take place within the context of the need not only for a lasting peace, but also for one that is sufficiently comprehensive to enable the rebuilding of institutions of governance, as well as the necessary resumption of the socioeconomic development process.

All the points that I have mentioned are what we, the United Nations membership, have proudly undertaken for more than 60 years of the peacekeeping effort and continue to do so. That is why peacekeeping has justifiably become the flagship activity of the United Nations. However, the Council, in cooperation with the entire United Nations membership, needs to put that same role into a clear perspective. In undertaking the task, a number of issues require the serious consideration of the Council and of the entire United Nations membership. For timekeeping reasons, I will mention only three of those issues.

First, if peacekeeping operations are to remain truly relevant, the mandates given to peacekeeping missions must be crystal clear with regard to both what they are envisaged to achieve and the resources available to implement them. In that vein, it remains imperative that the allotted resources be commensurate with the mandated tasks. That is critical in order to avoid the fallacy of overexpectation of what a peacekeeping mission can achieve and the local population's view of the same. It is also a question of ensuring that United Nations missions continue to have the cooperation and support of the population whom they are deployed to assist.

Secondly, given the extent of impunity for crimes usually perpetrated against an innocent civilian population by a multitude of increasingly criminal and even terrorist-oriented armed groups, SADC believes that it is not only logical but also imperative to keep in mind the operational and strategic consideration that troop- and police-contributing countries deploying troops to missions should be necessarily versatile, capable and sufficiently politically determined in both posture and mindset to deter impunity, including by using force where necessary when it is so mandated. In the medium to long terms, such active positive engagement will make would-be criminal elements think twice before targeting peacekeepers and the civilians whom the peacekeepers are deployed to protect and will enhance, rather than diminish, the safety and security of our peacekeepers.

Thirdly, to ensure the eventual resolution of conflict dynamics, it is important for troop- and police-contributing nations to bring their political capital to bear on the situation in tandem with their troop and police contingents. By the same token, out of practicality and a meaningful unity of effort, it is necessary that the United Nations strive to harness both the political will and the joint cooperation of the regional bloc to which the country in conflict belongs and those of all neighbouring nations bordering the country in conflict.

In observance of the above considerations, working in tandem and in close cooperation with the Security Council, SADC agreed to deploy the Force Intervention Brigade to the Democratic Republic of Congo under the aegis of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), as authorized by resolution 2098 (2013). The Brigade's robust posture contributed not only to the routing of the Mouvement du 23 mars, an illegal armed group that had reached an intolerable level of impunity by capturing a whole city within MONUSCO's area of responsibility, but also to the restoration of the population's confidence in MONUSCO.

We are proud of our continued active participation in that regard, as a participating regional body, as individual country signatories and as actors in the effort to achieve lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo through the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework. We believe that it is a role that will continue to be invaluable, given our new collective membership's experience, in efforts to peacefully resolve conflicts occurring in the region. SADC's collective conviction is therefore that eventual resolution of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo will only come about through a political settlement.

In closing, let me reiterate that SADC is committed to a continued partnership with the United Nations to enable the realization of sustainable peace and security in our region. In that connection, SADC would like to pay tribute to all of the men and women who have served and those who are serving today in various field missions under extremely difficult situations, sometimes in a hostile environment, for their dedication, courage and selfless sacrifice. In particular, we remember with sadness but gratitude those colleagues and friends who

have made the ultimate sacrifice through their efforts to contribute to the maintenance of peace and security.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands.

Mr. Van Oosterom (Netherlands): In honour of the Russian Federation's presidency of the Security Council this month, I will try to say the following in Russian:

(*spoke in Russian*)

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

(*spoke in English*)

I thank you, Sir, for organizing this timely and important debate. The Netherlands aligns itself with the statement made by the observer of the European Union.

We pay homage to those fallen in peacekeeping operations. We welcome the renewed attention to the commemoration of fallen peacekeepers on 29 May, and we express the hope that further enhancements to the commemoration ceremony will be agreed upon in the coming year. Our common aim is to improve mission effectiveness, protect civilians and mission personnel, and facilitate transition after the end of conflict. To realize those aims, four dimensions are, in our view, fundamental: innovation, integration, instruction and information.

With respect to innovation, the circumstances in which peacekeeping operations are taking place have changed fundamentally in recent years. Nowadays, non-State actors, rapidly changing environments, various challenges that are at the same time military, political and socioeconomic, and new threats call for innovation in our peacekeeping missions. Key elements in our view of innovation are the use of new technical possibilities, enhanced robustness and the need for guaranteed escalation dominance. As our contribution to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), the Netherlands has therefore deployed cutting-edge equipment and technology. The more effective we can make peacekeeping operations, the sooner transition to the post-conflict phase can take place.

Secondly, on integration, the new challenges also call for better integration of our efforts. Peacekeeping operations cannot function in isolation. In conflict situations, peace, justice and development issues are closely interlinked. Peacekeeping operations must therefore integrate diplomacy, defence and development, which we call the 3-D approach. Civil-military cooperation and coordination at the country level are also fundamental to effective mandate implementation. In order to improve integrated mission planning and execution, we encourage the strengthening of the planning capabilities at the United Nations Secretariat and at the mission management level.

Thirdly, on instruction, when addressing the new challenges, we should further improve the instruction and training of peacekeepers. The most valuable asset of the United Nations is naturally its personnel. Our men and women serve in dangerous locations where they can find themselves in harm's way while upholding the ideals of the Charter and the international community's responsibility to protect. Solid instruction and training for military and police personnel are thus of key importance. It prepares them for their difficult task and directly contributes to the effectiveness of the mission. Predeployment training for peacekeepers is therefore crucial, and in that training, special attention should be given to gender and child protection, as well as to the role of women in conflict prevention, peacemaking and peacebuilding processes.

We should reinforce the capacity of regional organizations to conduct the training and instruction of peacekeepers. I am proud to say that the Netherlands, in partnership with various countries, is actively engaged in regional training programmes aimed at enhancing the capabilities of peacekeepers.

Finally, information and information gathering, collating and sharing are crucial for peacekeeping operations. In order to make balanced decisions, around-the-clock situational awareness is fundamental. We, the Netherlands, have deployed an all-sources information fusion unit to MINUSMA in Mali to contribute to such awareness. Such units also contribute to the Rights up Front initiative through early warning with respect to human rights violations and the protection of civilians. We encourage the introduction of similar units into other missions in need of better situational awareness.

In conclusion, in applying innovation, integration and instruction and in improving information processes, peacekeeping missions will be more effective in realizing the mandates given to them by the Security Council. As said before, it is the ambition of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to be a partner for peace, justice and development. We will continue to be a partner with other Member States and the United

Nations system as whole in cooperatively making peacekeeping missions more effective.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. Eler (Turkey): At the outset, I would like to thank the Russian Federation presidency for organizing today's open debate. I would also like to express my appreciation to the Secretary-General for his briefing and for the work he is carrying out through the Secretariat to strengthen the peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations.

Peacekeeping operations play a critical role in supporting a country's efforts to provide a better future for its inhabitants. Peacekeeping is the flagship activity of the United Nations. For populations in need, peacekeepers are the face of the United Nations. The conditions under which today's peacekeepers operate have changed dramatically. The number of conflicts is, unfortunately, on the rise, and they are increasingly of an intra-State nature. Asymmetric threats involving armed non-State actors or terrorists with links to global organized crime are emerging.

Those changing conditions undoubtedly require that the concept of United Nations peacekeeping evolve. First, it is clear that the challenging circumstances and expectations with regard to protecting civilians require a change in the posture of peacekeeping operations, including through robust mandates. However, when robust peacekeeping is in question, we must do our utmost not to compromise a key asset of the United Nations, namely, impartiality. All efforts must be made to prevent any collateral damage and to win the hearts and minds of the people in order to mitigate the risks of local resentment, reaction and opposition to peacekeeping missions, all of which jeopardize success in the fulfilment of mandates.

Secondly, the safety and security of personnel must be given priority, given the increasing number of attacks on United Nations personnel. We would like take this opportunity to pay homage to the women and men serving as Blue Helmets and express our condolences to the survivors of the peacekeepers who have sacrificed their lives in the line of duty. In that context, the assets that modern technology offers, such as unarmed unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), must be utilized, as appropriate, to provide safety and security to mission personnel, so that they can fulfil their mission mandates. The use of UAVs for reconnaissance and surveillance increases situational awareness and thus saves lives. However, they must be used in strict conformity with international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of transparency.

On the other hand, proper personnel training and equipment must also be provided, keeping in mind the increasing professionalization of peacekeeping. However, such military measures alone are not the answer for better protecting our peacekeepers. Addressing the security and political situation in the country and winning the hearts and minds of the people will also be vital.

Thirdly, sharing assets between missions can provide increased efficiency and cost effectiveness. However, the most recent discussions on the issue demonstrate that there are a number of challenges that need to be addressed in order to make better use of that practice.

Fourthly, today's peacekeeping missions have increasingly comprehensive mandates. Security is a precondition for development, and development generates more security. Therefore, supporting national peacebuilding and peacemaking efforts should lie at the heart of peacekeeping operations. We thus welcome the development of the concept of multidimensional peacekeeping and the growing number of discussions on that subject, as highlighted in resolution 2086 (2013), which was adopted during Pakistan's presidency. For such multidimensional mandates to be successful, they must be realistic and flexible, and the missions must be provided with the necessary skills and capabilities from within the United Nations system or outside when necessary.

The changing nature of threats and actors has led to the need to intensify efforts against terrorism and organized crime at the United Nations, at both the mission and the Headquarters levels. Additionally, there is a clear need to strengthen cooperation and partnership with international, regional and subregional organizations. On the other hand, we have to redouble our efforts towards the peaceful resolution and prevention of conflicts, which saves lives, costs a fraction of peacekeeping efforts and eliminates the need to deploy new operations. In that context, we see mediation as an important tool, as it is consent-based and pertains to all stages of the conflict cycle, from prevention to resolution and implementation. We believe that reinforcing the capacities of the United Nations, regional and subregional organizations

and their member States in conflict resolution and prevention will help us to better manage the conflicts at hand and focus our efforts for a better world.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ireland.

Mr. Mawe (Ireland): Adapting to meet radically new and different environments and challenges, United Nations peacekeeping is in the process of undergoing significant change. We warmly welcome Russia's scheduling of today's debate, which provides a timely opportunity to consider the new trends in United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Ireland aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union and its member States.

Ireland has a strong and distinguished record in peacekeeping, with unbroken service in United Nations missions since our first deployment in 1958, including the appointment of an Irish national as head of a United Nations mission on 12 occasions. We see peacekeeping as a crucial instrument in maintaining and ensuring peace, preventing conflict and giving the necessary space and support to countries emerging from conflict to enable them to develop and grow. We therefore dearly wish to see a United Nations peacekeeping that is smart, fit for purpose and well-resourced to meet the high demands we place on it.

Those demands only continue to grow. The reality is that, in recent years, peacekeeping has evolved to such an extent that the term itself scarcely describes the range and nature of activities undertaken in its name. Today's debate is well informed by the concept note (S/2014/384, annex), which, above all else, calls for a more systematic and joined-up approach to justifying and elaborating the new trends in peacekeeping. Two of those developments stand out: more robust peace enforcement, undertaken in certain circumstances, and a more comprehensive and ambitious approach to institution- and State-building.

In 2000, Lakhdar Brahimi wrote that there can be no peacekeeping unless there is a peace to keep. Changes in the nature of conflict, however, mean that United Nations forces increasingly operate in less secure environments. In a small number of specific situations — for example, in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo — the United Nations has sought to be more proactive in how it protects the civilian population by supporting targeted offensive operations against armed groups.

Such robust operations do not, in our view, have any impact on the impartiality of United Nations peacekeeping. Impartiality does not mean having to adopt a neutral equidistance between two or more parties — in this case, Government forces and non-Government armed groups. Rather, impartiality is about implementing a mandate in a fair-minded and unbiased manner. It is a fundamental misreading of the nature of United Nations peacekeeping to see more proactive and robust targeting of armed groups aimed at protecting vulnerable civilians as in any way incompatible with the United Nations mission.

However, there is no doubt that more robust peace operations can work only if undertaken so as to deliver clear political goals and as part of a broader stabilization strategy. Higher-intensity peace enforcement also brings sharply into focus the imperative of having United Nations command-and-control arrangements that are fit for purpose, with decisive leadership, well-resourced planning and the reduction and elimination of national caveats and restrictions. Ireland is pleased to be organizing a panel discussion on 3 July at United Nations Headquarters to continue this important conversation and to consider the significant progress made to date and the challenges outstanding on command and control.

A second point resulting from operating in less secure environments concerns the safety of peacekeepers. We owe it to our service personnel, who are deploying into increasingly dangerous environments, to have them as well equipped as possible. It is sobering to remember that, to date this year, 37 persons serving in United Nations peacekeeping missions have been killed. We are convinced of the clear benefits offered by modern technology and high-tech equipment, notably the sharply increased situational awareness offered by unarmed unmanned aerial vehicles. Such tools and other technologies act simultaneously to strengthen the mission in delivering its mandate and to increase force protection.

Nationally, with over 130 members of our defence forces currently serving on the Golan with the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), Ireland is acutely aware of the imperative of strengthening force protection. An Irish and UNDOF force fully equipped with equipment to counter improvised explosive devices would be better able to protect itself and the civilian Syrian population from the threat posed by such devices.

The second, most striking change in United Nations peacekeeping is the dramatically increasing range of responsibilities and tasks with which United Nations missions are charged. Mission mandates have grown longer and more complex, particularly in terms of institution- and State-building. Meanwhile, resources have not increased in line with the increasing demand. There are a variety of ways to try to square that circle, including by increasing flexibility and innovation in relation to resources for missions, improving common standards and building strategic partnerships. Ireland is pleased to support the development of common standards relating to military police and special forces, but, realistically, some hard choices need to be made on just what can be expected of United Nations missions.

The Security Council should replace vague, aspirational mission mandates with mandates with a clear purpose tempered by achievable and realistic ambition. The recent work to refocus the mandate of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan and to reallocate to it resources from other United Nations missions in the region is a welcome step in the right direction. Given the scarcity of resources, there is also a clear case for moving to downsize or close some long-standing missions. It is important that that conversation on adjusting multidimensional mission mandates involve representatives of development agencies from the broader United Nations family.

We look forward to contributing further to this important reflection on the nature of United Nations peacekeeping and to seeing how these policy areas can be strengthened and developed.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Momen (Bangladesh): Let me join earlier speakers in congratulating the Russian Federation on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June and on organizing this open debate on the very relevant and timely topic of new trends in peacekeeping operations. I also take this opportunity to thank Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Hervé Ladsous for his comprehensive briefing today.

Since its inception, United Nations peacekeeping has been constantly evolving. The current period is no exception. Peacekeeping continues to face challenges and a huge range of demands. United Nations missions are assisting countries in making the difficult transition from conflict to peace and from chaos to State-building by supporting political processes aimed at establishing inclusive and legitimate Governments, providing security and catalysing peacebuilding processes. The current mandates of peacekeeping operations are more challenging and complex, necessitating long-term preparation and training for peacekeepers. In addition, a greater sense of commitment and dedication on the part of troop- and police-contributing countries is also essential. Troop- and police-contributing countries also face challenges in terms of fulfilling the robust mandates. In that context, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali and the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA) are worth mentioning.

To meet the increasing demand, there is a need to improve the rapid deployment and force generation process in the start-up of missions, not only for enablers but for all uniformed capacities. The challenges must be met through a variety of means, including joint and individual contributions. Various United Nations missions lack the appropriate capabilities for meeting the multifaceted challenges and demands associated with fulfilling mandates, assigned tasks and desired outcomes. Despite the utmost efforts of all partners, the United Nations is still finding it difficult to reach the capability level needed in terms of appropriate force generation, suitable mission support, in particular logistics, and other technical support.

United Nations peacekeepers have inherent operational limitations in terms of real-time intelligence gathering. Those limitations must be understood before they can be credibly deployed in complex conflict situations. Today, technology supports a wide range of tasks in United Nations peacekeeping operations beyond those undertaken by military and police forces, encompassing information and communication units, medical support, and analysis and reporting functions. The use of unmanned aerial surveillance systems is helping to improve situational awareness, early warning capacity, and the safety and security of peacekeeping personnel. We therefore fully support the appropriate use of modern technology to enhance the reach of the peacekeepers and increase operational capabilities in complex environments. However, we feel that technological means should be used prudently, sensitively and realistically, not to replace needed well-trained, capable peacekeepers on the ground who are

able to fulfil their assigned mandates with greater understanding.

In demanding situations and in order to fulfil robust mandates, there is a tendency to use peacekeepers in a combatant role. We must be able to differentiate between robust peacekeeping and the use of peacekeepers as combatants. We believe that any attempt to use peacekeepers as combatants will hamper their credibility and universal acceptability. Over the years, peacekeepers have built a good reputation in bringing long lasting peace to conflict-riven countries with professionalism and impartiality. We therefore must also create enabling conditions that protect peacekeepers so they can perform their traditional peacekeeping role.

It is important to realize that in the volatile situations or complex political and social environments where most peacekeeping missions are currently operating, there remain risks that peacekeepers will appear to favour one group or organization or other in a conflict, thereby clashing with the foreign policy of many Member States. For example, Bangladesh follows a policy of "friendship to all and malice to none". We would not like to see our peacekeepers siding with any warring factions and contradicting our national policy of friendship to all and malice to none. On that point, I fully support the statement made by Mr. Asoke Kumar Mukerji, Permanent Representative of India.

While the primary responsibility for the safety and security of peacekeepers and assets rests with the host country, the lead for United Nations security policy and procedure rests with the Department of Safety and Security. With every passing day, peacekeepers are being subjected to increasing threats. Weapons proliferation, sectarian violence and non-State actors are some of the factors that are making peacekeepers more vulnerable to multifaceted threats than ever before. Longer preparation on the part of troop- and police-contributing countries, developing realistic and achievable mandates and well-coordinated efforts from all the stakeholders can ensure better safety and a secure environment for peacekeepers. In our efforts to maintain global peace and security under Blue Helmets, we have lost more than 112 valiant men and women.

Protecting civilians under imminent threat of physical violence is now a key area of focus for nine peacekeeping operations that represent about 95 per cent of deployed peacekeeping personnel. Implementing the protection of civilian mandates in a coordinated and expedient manner requires dedicated coordination and the input of all concerned parties, which adds to the challenges that mission leadership in general and peacekeepers in particular face in complex and fluid situations. In addition, at times, the credibility of the United Nations is questioned due to its inability to intervene and protect the civilians in time, as was seen in the cases of UNMISS and MINUSCA. Clearly, there is scope to deliver a lot more in that regard.

With respect to reimbursement for peacekeepers, I strongly echo the statement of the Permanent Representative of India and call on the Council to increase reimbursement on the basis of the rates proposed in the survey commissioned by the General Assembly. In addition, we do not support the mixing of mandates in a single mission — a point that was also emphasized by my Indian colleague. I would also highlight the importance of providing appropriate logistical support to peacekeepers so that they can deliver their best on the ground. Our police personnel and aviation unit in South Sudan had extremely tough days as a result of the lack of even minimum mission support. I am sure they deserve much more than what they have received.

Finally, I would like to stress the importance of strengthening the partnership and coordination among the Security Council, troop- and police-contributing countries and the Secretariat — also known as triangular cooperation. It needs to grow further and stronger through improved information exchange and increased strategic planning and consultations and by promoting cohesiveness and ownership among the various stakeholders, including parties to conflict. As one of the leading troop- and police-contributing countries, we would like to assure the Security Council of our continued support in efforts to strengthen the partnership. We urge the Council to allow the troop- and police-contributing countries to join in dialogue and discussion under article 44 of the Charter prior to making decisions on and mandates for United Nations peacekeeping operations. We believe that increased partnership, collaboration, political commitment and dialogue can work together to help us to achieve our goals of attaining global peace, security and stability more effectively and more efficiently.

Mrs. Malenga (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*spoke in French*): Mr. President, I would first like to express my great satisfaction at seeing you preside over the Security Council in this month of June, and

our honour at having the Russian Federation guide the deliberations of the Council today.

I cannot fail to mention the remarkable stewardship of your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea, at the helm of the Security Council last month .

My delegation associates itself with the statement made earlier by the representative of Malawi on behalf of the Southern African Development Community. We would like to thank you, Mr. President, for giving us the opportunity to speak before the Security Council at today's public debate on new trends in peacekeeping, under the agenda item entitled "United Nations peacekeeping operations".

The topic chosen is all the more significant for being at the very heart of the activities of the United Nations since its inception. We recall that the peacekeeping operations are not just about maintaining international peace and security; they are also called upon to help countries torn by conflict to create the conditions for returning to a lasting peace. Peacekeeping operations must in particular facilitate the political process, protect civilians, assist in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, support the organization of free elections, protect and promote human rights and restore State authority in conflict-torn areas.

In my delegation's view, the success of peacekeeping operations depends on their ability to adapt to the dynamics of new challenges and current political realities. As to new trends in this area, I would like to mention the example of the practices followed by the Security Council in my own country, the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As we all know, the Security Council recently adopted resolution 2147 (2014), renewing the mandate of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and that of the Force Intervention Brigade. We have all witnessed the effective and commendable role played by the Intervention Brigade alongside the Forces armées de la République démocratique du Congo in support of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the restoration of the authority of the State over the entirety of its territory.

That is why the second mandate of the Intervention Brigade will, in fact, be the culmination of efforts already undertaken to consolidate and preserve lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and throughout the Great Lakes region. Meanwhile, the Government is now shouldering the task of creating the rapid reaction force that is to take over for the Intervention Brigade at the designated time.

The conclusion and implementation of the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Region, which was concluded in Addis Ababa on 24 February 2013, and the adoption of resolution 2098 (2013), which strengthened the Framework, represent major innovations in both the understanding of the crisis in the Great Lakes region since the late 1990s and the traditional United Nations doctrine of peacekeeping.

The very first use of surveillance drones in a United Nations peacekeeping operation occurred in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and sets a precedent, sounding the death knell for the traditional concept of peacekeeping operations and paving the way for the use of modern technology aimed at making peacekeeping operations effective and efficient. For the long-suffering populations of the countries in the region, the Framework and the aforementioned resolution are seen as compelling evidence of the international community's determination to help find a definitive solution to the unstable situation, which has lasted too long and for which my country has paid such a heavy toll.

We must recall the sad and often overlooked reality that my country has lost over 6 million people to our chronic conflict. That is a tragedy of a scale without equal in the history of humankind, and humankind cannot remain indifferent before it, if it does not wish to lose its soul. Our meeting today therefore reflects our shared desire to reaffirm our humanity, assess together and in an uncompromising manner the concept of peacekeeping and identify the challenges that remain so that, once lasting peace is restored, the State can devote its energy and faculties to the key issues of fighting poverty and improving the living conditions of its people.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. McLay (New Zealand): Thank you, Mr. President, for convening this very important debate.

At the outset, New Zealand recognizes those brave military, civilian and police personnel who risk their lives in United Nations peacekeeping operations, and

we pay particular tribute to those who have been killed in those operations.

United Nations peacekeeping is a global partnership, and New Zealand regards peacekeeping as one of the greatest achievements of the United Nations. The blue beret is a powerful symbol of the international community's commitment to peace and security. However, right now, that same United Nations peacekeeping is under very serious stress due to unprecedented demand, the complexity of new security threats, undiagnosed root causes, lack of effective early warning from the field, insufficient inclusion of troop-contributing countries and other major stakeholders and, not least, the risks of premature transitions out of peacekeeping mode. All of that suggests that the Security Council, as the legal decision maker on peacekeeping, must do a lot better.

However, responsibility for the stress runs wider, as does responsibility for the solutions. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of the General Assembly has too often been locked in an unproductive struggle, and that has been a lost opportunity for delivering the policy support that peacekeeping needs. In addition, the Fifth Committee must find an equitable and fair solution to the issue of troop reimbursements for troop-contributing countries.

Peacekeeping must continue to evolve to meet changing circumstances and new challenges. New Zealand supports the evolution, over recent years, of multidimensional mandates. When designed sensibly, with good oversight, quick impact projects, adequate resources and a strategy for progressive transition to peacebuilding, such operations can be a very positive United Nations contribution to restoring international peace and security.

New Zealand fully understands the concerns expressed about the difficulties inherent in the robust mandates that have recently been approved by the Council. However, the solution is not to simply retreat to the peacekeeping of the past. Neutral observer missions still have their rightful and important place. Many others in this debate have already pointed out that the Brahimi Report reminded us that there are times when the United Nations cannot stand aside. There are times when it must act, and we should never forget that the Charter recognizes that collective action is a central role of the United Nations. It is not correct to suggest that the recent robust mandates in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali and the Central African Republic are entirely new. Indeed, for over a decade, robust civilian protection mandates have been a reality for most peacekeeping missions.

Fortunately, force rarely needs to be used, but the capacity and the authority to act are important deterrents. We saw limited robust United Nations action in Côte d'Ivoire in 2011 and, much more recently, we have seen how robust United Nations capacity can save lives in South Sudan. Those new peacekeeping trends also mean that the Council must do better in recognizing the role and competence of regional and subregional organizations. New Zealand has seen and learned the value of regional involvement in peacekeeping from within its own region.

Supporting and working more effectively with the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the Economic Community of West African States, the Economic Community of Central African States and the African Union is an important challenge that must be addressed.

New Zealand acknowledges, and is sensitive to, the concerns of troop- and police-contributing countries in respect of the recent peacekeeping developments. Significant changes in peacekeeping, whether they be broad trends on the enhanced use of technology, robust mandates or significant changes in mission mandates, must only be made with consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries. There are already general undertakings from the Council regarding that engagement with troop- and police-contributing countries, and the future challenge for Council members is to implement those undertakings in a consistent and satisfactory manner.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. Emiliou (Cyprus): Cyprus aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union.

I would like to thank the Russian Federation for organizing such an important and timely debate.

Cyprus would like to pay tribute to all the men and women who have served and continue to serve in peacekeeping missions around the world. Their contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security is invaluable.

The year 2014 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). I take this opportunity

to extend our deep appreciation and gratitude to the United Nations and its Member States, in particular all those Member States who have contributed troops to UNFICYP throughout the years. Cyprus can attest, from its own experience, that the maintenance of international peace and security would be precarious without United Nations peacekeeping in many parts of the world.

Peacekeeping remains one of the primary tools through which the United Nations fulfils its principal mandate — the maintenance of international peace and security. Peacekeeping has gone through various phases and is now more multidimensional than ever before. That is largely due to the ever-changing nature of conflicts, which have become more internalized and thus more challenging and complex and with more far-reaching effects on regional and international peace and security.

The emergence of new challenges requires the collective and organized response of the international community. They underline the need for this debate, as well as for our quest for efficiency and modernization to be ongoing. Increased challenges also underline the need for the cost-effective use of resources and the most efficient resource allocation. Those, however, should be in line, and not to the detriment of, the ability of peacekeeping missions to adequately and effectively fulfil their mandate.

It is necessary that modern peacekeeping adapt to new needs and challenges, for example by adequately equipping peacekeepers and civilian personnel. Up-to-date technology is a sine qua non for the execution of the mandate of all United Nations peacekeeping operations. Cyprus commends the efforts made so far in that direction and would like to encourage the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to keep looking into possibilities for the expanded use of modern technology.

In line with that, we would like to stress the importance of the security of the Blue Helmets and civilian personnel, which is closely associated with the use of upgraded equipment and modern tools. Safeguarding the welfare of peacekeepers and providing an upgraded working and living environment should also form part of our priorities. In that regard, we are in favour of the idea of extending peacekeeping mandates, when necessary, so that the safety and security of peacekeepers is guaranteed. We also consider that the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations provide a comprehensive context of specific ideas that correspond to evolving needs.

In discussing modern peacekeeping, the need for a broader introduction of a gender perspective in peacekeeping operations and the full implementation of Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security come to the fore. Cyprus attaches great importance to the pivotal role of women in conflict management and resolution with the aim of achieving sustainable peace, and we would very much welcome increased participation of women in peace processes and peacekeeping operations, including in senior roles.

In that regard we feel privileged to have two women at the top of the United Nations mission in Cyprus. In addition to the current Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of UNFICYP, Ms. Lisa Buttenheim, we will soon have the pleasure of welcoming to Cyprus Major General Kristin Lund, the next UNFICYP Force Commander and the first ever woman to lead a United Nations peacekeeping force. We are certain that their insight will prove decisive in our effort.

In this volatile international environment, it is of utmost importance to adhere to the principles of the Charter, specifically to the principle of respect for State sovereignty, when deploying peacekeeping operations. It is essential that our efforts address the root causes of international conflicts and that we undertake solid and tangible steps that will enhance the United Nations collectiveness and reaffirm our joint commitment to upholding and strengthening the principles and values of the Organization.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 3.40 p.m.